



3 1761 11970132 4

AR3734



Presented to
The Library
of the
University of Toronto
by
James Stewart, Esq.

CA1 Z1

-55 C21

Canada. Royal commission on broadcasting.

Hearings. v. 13-16. 1956.

1957



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
University of Toronto

71 13

ROYAL COMMISSION
ON
BROADCASTING

HEARINGS

HELD AT

EDMONTON, ALTA.

MAY 23, 1956

v. 13

ROYAL COMMISSION ON BROADCASTING

Edmonton, Alberta,
May 23, 1956.

PRESENT:

THE CHAIRMAN ROBERT M. FOWLER

COMMISSIONER EDMOND TURCOTTE

COMMISSIONER JAMES STEWART

COMMISSION COUSEL JAMES M. COYNE
A. J. deGRANDPRE

SECRETARY PAUL PELLETIER

SUBMISSIONS BY:

STATION CJCA

Mr. Gerry Gaetz
Mr. R.W. Barnes

CFAC CALGARY

Mr. A.M. Cairns

EXHIBIT NO. 88: Brief of Station CJCA Edmonton.

---On resuming at 9.30 A.M.:

SUBMISSION OF STATION CJCA

THE CHAIRMAN: This morning, ladies and gentlemen, we have two briefs to hear, one from Station CJCA Edmonton, and the other from Station CFAC Calgary. Perhaps I should begin as I have previously in case what I said on other days has not been remembered, as to our procedure. Perhaps it is doubly necessary where we have two similar briefs, and only those two, coming this morning. We have adopted the practice of having the brief presented and then questioning the people who present the briefs. We do this solely in order to bring out the facts and to be sure we understand what the submissions are. No one should read into any question any conclusions by the Commission or even any attitude of mind. It is merely the desire to get at the facts and get them fully before us for our consideration later, along with all the evidence.

Mr. Gaetz, you are presenting the brief for Station CJCA?

MR. GAETZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will begin by marking it as Exhibit 88.

EXHIBIT NO. 88: Brief of Station CJCA Edmonton.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are not in an overwhelming hurry, and I would like you to feel free to present the brief as fully as you wish.

MR. GAETZ: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read the brief, but first I would

like to thank you and the Commissioners for accepting our brief at a rather late time, and I would like to introduce Mr. Barnes, the Assistant Manager of CJCA, and also I would like to introduce some other members of my staff who are here and who will be available for questioning. I asked these gentlemen to come along in case there were questions you wished to ask.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am very glad you did. While I think you will be able to answer the questions, it is good to have the others here and be able to question them if need be.

MR. GAETZ: "The history of the station: CJCA was one of the first stations to be established on the prairies, going on the air in April of 1922 with a power of 50 watts, increased to 500 in 1923. Subsequently the station increased power to 1000 watts, and in 1947 a further increase to 5000 watts was completed; this is the maximum power assigned to this frequency.

"CJCA is operated by Edmonton Broadcasting Company Limited. This company is owned 60 per cent by Southam Company Limited and 40 per cent by Taylor Pearson and Carson Canada Limited. It is worth noting that these two companies are public companies and, as such, the shares are widely held, shareholders including a number of staff members.

"Station's transmitter is located at Ellerslie, about six miles south of the city.

At the Ellerslie location, we also operate VE9AI -- a low-power short-wave station serving the far north.

"Studios are located in the Birks Building, corner of Jasper and 104th Street. At studio location, CJCA operates an FM transmitter, the first one installed in Western Canada.

CBC Affiliation:

"When the Canadian Radio Commission established its network, CJCA became a basic station of that network. As such, we carried all commercial network and the sustaining service as agreed upon by the station and the network. As an early station on the network, CJCA originated many programs to the national network.

"CJCA remained a basic station of the CRBC network, later of the CBC network and still later of the CBC Trans-Canada network.

"With the advent of CBX, at Lacombe, however, CJCA became a supplementary station. This arrangement provides CJCA with network broadcasts of events of national importance, and the station may be added to the commercial networks at the sponsor's request.

"We do view with alarm the apparent lack of sales effort to maintain the networks, and it may be that, in years to come, 'tape' or 'transcriptions' may ultimately replace most commercial networks, with the exception, of course, of sports events, and such programs

which, because of a time factor, must go almost simultaneously across the country.

"The listener in Edmonton, or in the area served by the Edmonton stations, has a choice of six radio stations -- more Canadian stations per capita than any other comparable area in Canada. He may choose any one of the four private stations (one of them a French language station), he may choose either of the two frequencies which the CBC operates as CBX and CBX-A, or he may choose the non-commercial station.

"In view of some of the submissions made to the Royal Commission which have urged the elimination of commercial radio, it is interesting to note that, in the Edmonton area, where the listener has his choice of private commercial stations, the CBC or a completely non-commercial station, competent and impartial surveys taken over a period of years indicate that three of the private commercial stations among them share approximately 90 per cent of the listening audience.

"It is in this area, then, of competition with other private commercial stations, with the CBC and with a non-commercial station that our station operates. It is the objective of this station, as it is of every private station, to provide service for every portion of and every taste in the community it serves. In order to do this, we must supply as many listeners as possible with what they want to hear, whether

it be news, commentary, drama, sports, children's programs, music, information, market reports, religious programs, recipes, or, simply the company of a friendly voice. In addition to all these services, however, it is in its dual role of community servant and community leader that the private station is unchallenged.

"It is to illustrate this dual role that we submit a sampling survey of the type of programming and the types of services offered by this station. We wish to emphasize that similar broadcasting is carried out by all local private stations."

I would like, sir, at this point if I may, to read a letter to the editor in the Edmonton Journal of May 18th, and it is addressed to the editor:

"As an average radio listener, I would like to point out a few of the things that private radio stations have done over a period of many years.

"I figure this is necessary, because in my limited spare time I have followed quite closely the arguments against private radio by various people who seem to have the idea that private radio stations do nothing but sell soap all day. I think advertising is a very important part of our Canadian economy, and I wish I could do more in my pure-bred cattle business. I, for one, want to know if somebody is having a used car sale, lumber sale, or

if there is a brand of tooth paste that will prevent tooth decay, and if a new supermarket opens.

"For the period of years, and it is nearly 40 now, that I have lived in Alberta, radio has been a big part of my farm life. Thinking over what private stations have offered me in the last 20 years, I can recall special events, sports, women commentators, religious broadcasts, political talks, weather forecasts, market reports, plays, announcements of farm and city activities, to mention a few. If a person listened to a station such as CJCA and did not move his dial, over a period of hours, he would hear most of the things I have just mentioned. Private broadcasters in Alberta have done practically all the worthwhile farm broadcasting; the programs are early in the morning and at noon, and the implement companies and the Wheat Pool have major newcasts.

"I am sure, Mr. Editor, that private broadcasters have realized their responsibilities and could continue to expand their efforts if unhampered by governmental regulation. Somebody said at one of the royal commission hearings that if private networks were formed they would not pay the artist as much as the CBC. In every other line of work it is said that private concerns pay higher wages to their employees as compared to the civil servants.



I believe it would follow that private networks would pay their artists more, but, mind you, they might work them a little harder. As a farm listener I think the people of Alberta should be thankful for the contribution of private broadcasters because they seem to know what the public wants and also are a step ahead of the public in new features which no doubt they are very pleased to give us."

The letter is signed by Mr. David Ball, a farmer west of Edmonton.

For the convenience of the Commission we have sent out the details of our types of programs under subheadings of Talent, Public Service, Special Features, Religious Broadcasts, News, Sports, Farm Broadcasting.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have read all those, and by all means outline them in any way you wish, but you can take it that we have read them.

MR. GAETZ: Mr. Douglas Homersham has been responsible for the development of our dramatic talent, and you will note from the brief he has had a great measure of success. CJCA Players began in 1943 and they have gone on, as I have listed in the brief, to become a very active group in the community. In addition to the material we have supplied in the brief about their activities, they are still heard each winter on a special series of dramatic shows broadcast during the week. It is important, I think, to note that the call list of

professionally trained actors today stands at more than forty, and the training programme for the development of new talent continues. Many stars have gone on to bigger fields, having received their start with the CJCA Players, among them Olga Laruska (Dianne Foster) now in T.V. and Motion Pictures in Hollywood; Jack Mather, in radio and T.V. production in Toronto; Lois McLean, in T.V. and radio production with the B.B.C. Hamstead London England, and John Granik, T.V. production in Toronto.

In 1955 the CJCA Players won the Beaver Award for outstanding contribution in radio drama for Canada.

"We have at all times endeavoured to further the development of talent in Edmonton. Another example of this is the complete support of the Edmonton Pops Concerts during the summer season. Some forth to fifty musicians organize and stage this series of Pops concerts, and, if the attendance is high, the financial remuneration to the musician is adequate. We endeavour to see that each concert is well attended by giving, entirely without charge, an unlimited amount of spot announcement time. In addition we record the entire concert during the performance and air an edited version of the musical highlights the Sunday following the night of the concert. The tape recording of the entire concert is made available and played over for the musicians at their convenience as a guide

to the development of a high standard in performances.

"The same consideration is given to the Edmonton Symphony during its series of winter concerts and, in addition, CJCA supports the work of the Symphony with an annual cash donation of \$500."

It is interesting to note that neither of these people wish their concerts broadcast but rather treated as we treat them.

"The promotion of art groups in the City of Edmonton goes far beyond the groups already mentioned. Each year we contribute over a thousand dollars in time, materials and money in support of the annual Carol Festival.

"No group supporting the 'living theatre' in Edmonton is required to spend funds beyond the realm of sound financial administration in order to promote and publicize its show. In particular we refer to the Edmonton Civic Opera, The Light Opera of Edmonton, Varieties, Orion Musical Theatre, the Edmonton Theatre (Circle Eight), and The Follies, the latter sponsored by the Junior Hospital League. It is true that many of these organizations have extended to radio a token payment for publicity but never have we drawn a line of restriction as to the amount of time and publicity available to them for the success of their production. For example when the Light Opera of Edmonton staged

Oklahoma they were fifteen hundred dollars in debt. We led the campaign to publicize this show and threw many hundreds of dollars of donated time into the publicity pot with the result that the six day showing was a complete sell-out and Oklahoma was held over for another three days. A similar contribution was made to the Edmonton Theatre production Three Men On A Horse. Every means of adequately publicizing this show was explored and the facilities of the station were offered free of charge to the organization over and above the token payment of \$30.00, which they offered to the station in part payment for such support. When the show had finished its three day run, the bills were totalled up and the Edmonton Theatre found itself in debt from the operation. CJCA wrote off the token charge they had offered and extended to them the facilities of the medium of radio to conduct an extensive drive for membership on a season ticket basis so that this organization will soon be on a stable financial footing.

"We believe that by giving leadership and direct financial assistance to groups supporting the 'living theatre' in Edmonton and Northern Alberta as a whole, through the medium of radio promotion and publicity, one of the basic fundamentals of the development and furtherance of creative talent can be realized."

I would like, sir, to read a little of our

public service. I think it may well be that CJCA was one of the first stations to co-ordinate all these public service activities under one department, and that department is under the direction of Mr. Douglas Homersham, who is Director of Special Services, and is responsible for all our public service.

"Public Service: It is impossible to dwell at length on the contributions made to organizations throughout the year in every detail but we have established and practised a similar policy in regard to charitable and community service organizations. In 1955 this station served, through its public service department, over 150 charitable and community service organizations and donated broadcasting time valued at \$23,569.90. This is a record achievement for any year since our Public Service department was organized six years ago . . . and even that does and cannot tell the whole story of public service. There are many other ways these and other organizations have received benefit . . . through our programme department, news, sport, farm broadcasts, special feature broadcasts, sponsored shows through courtesy of station accounts . . . and by direct cash donations. It is also a fact that no one either an individual or an organization in need has been denied the facilities of this station solely for lack of funds."

We go on to list the various features. Shirley Speaking, a daily woman commentator feature, half an hour a day, covering current civic and cultural projects, welfare organizations, and so on. We have mentioned Club Calendar, a broadcast which is handled by two 'Personality' voices on the staff, which runs Monday through Friday in the afternoon.

"Hello The North: People living in the north were quick to see the possibilities of contact with the outside through the medium of radio -- and, at the request of northern residents, CJCA applied for and obtained, some thirty years ago, a licence to broadcast person-to-person messages. The bush pilots who opened the airlines to the north areas had not yet established airmail routes -- and contact with the outside was limited to mails twice a year. The only emergency communication existing was at points which had established signal stations, and winter communication between these stations and outlying points was made by dog teams."

We go on to describe the service offered on Hello The North, and messages broadcast to people in the northern areas. For some years CJCA ran a special broadcast on Saturday nights from midnight to one a.m., when such things as market reports and so on were released. The programme was discontinued after the war.

We have included in our brief the story of

the Mercy flight to Fort Vermilion done by 'Wop' May, in the early years, and it was on instructions from CJCA that a runway was provided -- a dramatic and interesting story.

Under our Public Service we have done a first class job on the matter of road maps. Each spring road bans are placed on the road for heavy traffic and we have set up three services daily for road ban announcements. It is interesting to note we broadcast 130 road ban announcements and served 21 municipalities within our coverage area.

We do extensive weather reporting giving complete news coverage to all north-central Alberta regions. The newscasting contains the weather in brief with complete regional coverage at six, eight and ten p.m.. These programmes go into detail as to the sources of current weather disturbances with present weather conditions at official weather recording centres.

We list in our brief two special newscasts that have been included at the request of the regions in two particular areas. The Chamber of Commerce from McMurray in northeast Alberta approached CJCA asking for a daily weather report in that area; and the other is a special service for the fishermen at SlaveLake. Their problem is that if wind comes up their nets are substantially damaged, and it is our policy to give a complete news coverage for the area.

Finally, under Public Service, CJCA was one of the original organizers of the Radio Bureau,

and it is through the Bureau that CJCA runs weekly talks giving listeners the weekly highlights from Ottawa.

We have outlined a number of our special features under Mrs. K. G. Montgomery, who was appointed Canadian delegate to the fall session, 1954, of the United Nations. Prior to her departure, CJCA arranged to have Mrs. Montgomery tape a fifteen-minute talk each week and forward it to CJCA.

We felt the Commission may be interested in a feature that ran during the fall and winter entitled "What's Your Opinion"; the broadcast was the panel type discussion, and our farm director acted as moderator. We chose two students from city schools and two from country schools, and each week we have a guest on the programme. You may be interested in the titles of some of the discussions. On January 29th it was "Causes of Racial and Religious Prejudices", and the guest was the Reverend Edmond White of the First Baptist Church. On January 28th the British North America Act was discussed. On January 1st, the Future; our guest was Dr. Andrew Stewart, President of the University of Alberta; and so on. It was interesting to note the tremendous interest these young people took in the broadcast, and we thought you would be interested to know of them.

Another feature is "One Man's Viewpoint", which is a programme prepared and presented by a prominent Edmonton lawyer Mr. Stan Ross, and Mr. Ross puts forward his opinion on topics of the day.

The Edmonton Story we believe is a particularly interesting feature, which has been broadcast for the past five years. CJCA has featured a series of twice-weekly broadcasts called the Edmonton Story. This story is written by Tony Cashman of CJCA's News Department and has become, in effect, an official history of the city. All stories are filed with the Provincial Librarian at the request of that office and entered in the Archives of Alberta. Mr. Cashman hopes to have in print this fall his first book "An Early History of Edmonton".

Similarly with Courtesy Versus Death: In the interests of traffic safety, CJCA broadcasts a quarter hour every Monday night at 8.15 p.m. featuring Sergeant Jim Rogers, of the Edmonton Traffic Squad and Merrel Dahlgren, of CJCA's technical department.

In the afternoon we have a fifteen-minute scheduled for peak traffic periods suggesting good driving hints and traffic rules.

In children's programmes CJCA caters to young listeners, and the young listener to CJCA has the opportunity of participating in these programmes.

Also under Special Features, the lover of opera music has a two and a half-hour programme devoted to his interests each Sunday evening. On this programme, listeners' requests are played and records from private collections are aired.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is entirely recorded,

is it?

MR. GAETZ: Recorded, yes. The letters we have received indicate a growing interest in the programme.

"As it does throughout its program schedule, CJCA offers a wide range of religious broadcasts. The Roman Catholic program 'The Sacred Heart' is heard early Sunday morning. We broadcast the morning service from one of five different Protestant Churches at eleven each Sunday. In addition, Dr. E. G. Thompson, Director of St. Stephen's College, prepares and presents a half-hour, non-denominational religious program -- Christian Faith -- at 10.30 each Sunday."

We go on to explain the support we have given to various of the church campaigns, and the last one was the building of St. Mary's Boys' Home. The boys are now housed in what I consider to be one of the finest buildings in Canada.

"News: CJCA was among the first radio stations to establish a fully operative news department with regular coverage of established news beats including the City Hall, the Legislative Buildings, the Police, Armed Forces, Hotels, and daily press conferences.

"The five man news department prepares 27 newscasts daily, Monday through Saturday, 11 newscasts on Sunday three special weather shows daily. Features in the News Monday through Saturday and, while the Legislature is in

session -- Legislative Report.

"The Two-man sports department prepares and voices four sports casts daily.

"For complete National and International news, CJCA has three news service teletypes -- Broadcast News, B.U.P. and the Canadian Press Newspaper Service.

"CJCA's newsmen have travelled widely to cover such special events as political conventions, annual meetings of the Alberta Chamber of Commerce and Agriculture, Army and Air Force S Summer Camps. One of the summer camp coverages extended to Gagetown, New Brunswick with Tony Cashman, the newsman reporting back by telephone on highlights of the training. Other special trips have included tours of the north and Air Force Rescue searchers for missing planes."

Our newsmen have covered the continent, province and community, and the coverage of news stories, aside from regular news, CJCA has featured complete coverage of elections on the federal, provincial and municipal level. During provincial and federal elections we arrange for coverage throughout about 35 communities surrounding Edmonton.

"Legislative Report: As mentioned earlier, CJCA gives complete daily news-beat coverage of the Alberta Legislative Buildings. This coverage includes complete coverage of Legislative sessions.

"When the house is sitting, CJCA carries

a five-minute summary of the highlights of Legislative business each evening, within an hour of the close of the house."

Incidentally, we have received letters of appreciation both from the political parties of the Legislature and from our listeners, on the service we run.

Features In The News is a slightly different newscast in that it goes fairly deeply into the feature events throughout Alberta, Canada and the world. Here again, tape recordings from distant centres are used.

Our Weekly Newspaper Roundup, similar to that of other stations, features material from the newspapers in northern and central Alberta, and is found to be a very popular feature. Thirty-two weekly newspapers contribute to the programme with credit given to each paper whenever a news or editorial item is used.

We have listed in the Emergency Service the story of the disappearance of Dianne Mason, and I think I should add, to complete that story, that they have never found any trace of this poor little girl who was lost. We recorded appeals from her mother and sent them to all stations in Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia.

The Town of Ryley was threatened by fire. CJCA was asked to co-operate in appeals for fire-fighting facilities from nearby towns. A frantic call from the telephone operator at Ryley said the switchboard was being closed down because of the fire.

Two newsmen dispatched to the scene reported factually on developments and because of fire fighting assistance from other towns the fire was confined to one block.

Jasper Place town flooding, required a large number of volunteers and earth moving equipment. CJCA again co-operated with factual reports and appeals. Sufficient equipment and men were soon rounded up and appeals for food were quickly filled.

A number of bridges were washed out in northern Alberta this spring. These were reported immediately by CJCA to warn and re-route travellers in the areas concerned.

In 1952, CJCA's News Department won 'The Distinguished Achievement Award', presented by the National Association of Radio News Directors for complete all-round news coverage. The competition included Canadian and American stations.

Sport news coverage is basically the same as that established for news. Our sportscasters have travelled across the west and to Eastern Canada for coverage of sporting events.

Actuality broadcasts are a major feature of CJCA's sports coverage and include regularly schedule broadcasts of hockey, baseball and junior football, stock car racing, horse racing, tennis, wrestling, boxing and basketball.

CJCA is proud of its record in covering the Dominion Basketball final in Vancouver this spring. The broadcasts over CJCA were the only ones covering

the finals for Edmonton listeners whose own team was competing.

In support of Junior Hockey, CJCA promoted a Junior Hockey night and was successful in creating enough new interest in the Junior Hockey situation to assure the continuance of this sport in the city.

Our program "Cavalcade of Sport" simulates a network broadcast through the use of tape recordings from other sports centres across Canada.

I would like to spend some time on our Farm Broadcasting: CJCA devotes a considerable portion of its broadcasting schedule to farm programs.

City audiences as well as farm enjoy good farm programs and we feel that it is very important that the farmers' problems are brought to the attention of the urban listener.

CJCA was the first station to establish a full time farm broadcaster and he travels by car at least 2500 miles every year getting features for his programs. In the last six years, for example, our Farm Director has held a weekly program from six to seven a.m. and one at 12.15 noon five days a week plus special Sunday morning programs, of one-half hour duration.

On the farm programs, there is a bulletin board service which announces coming events, gives well-baby immunization clinic times for municipalities, and gives notice of meetings. In the past year the Farmers Union of Alberta, for example, has had at least 1200 free announcements of their activities.

Agricultural experts, farmers, home and school associations, industrialists, statesmen and farmers are interviewed on this program.

The Farm Show is credited with many success stories regarding the introduction of new farming practices, and new livestock raising techniques.

Each year our farm director goes to the Royal Winter Fair in Toronto and sends back recordings of the day's activity and the views of the people of the Edmonton area who go there.

Two years ago CJCA's Farm Director went to Scotland, England and Ireland, and obtained tape recordings on bull sales, farming, and industrial life in these three countries. He gave an illustrated lecture with slides, to approximately 100 different communities in Central Alberta, at no expense to any community or farm organization.

Earlier this spring he visited Australia, and returned with tape recordings and coloured slides to carry on the same kind of extension work at CJCA's expense. There has been enthusiastic response from Home and School Associations, Farmers Union Locals, Fair Boards, Agricultural Societies, to this phase of our farm broadcasting.

Our Farm Director knows practically everybody in Central and Northern Alberta, and has been in every centre, large and small, in every part of the country, either as a public speaker or a broadcaster. He is a graduate of the Faculty of Agriculture at the University of Alberta, and served for five and

one-half years in the Canadian Army overseas in World War II. He is referred to as the "Voice of Agriculture in Alberta."

And at this point I would like to introduce as part of our brief a copy of our recent Farm Survey.

(Page 2097 follows)

Each year CJCA has a farm survey taken in order to know to what extent our station is listened to by farm listeners. This is a survey taken in February this year, and we take the survey, as I say, to find out whether or not we are supplying the kind of information that the farmers like and can use and in addition we try to find out some other activities. The first question is: "To which station do you turn your radio on in the morning?" We are fortunate in that they tune in CJCA and I think perhaps of our farm show, 62 per cent. We have asked such other questions as, "What station do you tune in in the morning?" We find out that farmers get up about five o'clock in the summer or six o'clock in the winter and we asked whether or not they took a daily newspaper and found that practically 75 per cent of them did not take a daily newspaper. I think that is mainly true because of transportation; their paper would be two or three days old. Then we asked, "At lunch time, to which station do you listen for the farm broadcast?" And we are fortunate in having 62 per cent.

THE CHAIRMAN: You must have left the sets on, that is the same again.

MR. GAETZ: There are other farm broadcasts as well as ours and we were interested whether they reached the maximum number of people, we were anxious to know to which station they tuned at supper time, also. There has been a great deal of talk as to whether or not there was television in

this country and whether or not people have television sets and 93 per cent of them do not have a television set as yet. That would be partly due to the fact that there are still a good many farms that are not electrified, I think there are 65 per cent of the farms in this area electrified and in ten years they figure 75 per cent, and I understand there are no battery television sets available.

THE CHAIRMAN: What particular area would this survey cover?

MR. GAETZ: The map on the back will give you an idea of the centres from which the phone calls were made.

THE CHAIRMAN: But how far would it be, it may be marked here -- the coverage would be a total of what?

MR. GAETZ: One hundred and twenty-five miles.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was wondering about the potential range of the television transmitter in this area?

MR. GAETZ: Well, I understand they can get the local television station as far south as Red Deer and as far west as Lloydminster.

THE CHAIRMAN: So this area would be pretty well within the range of the television transmitter?

MR. GAETZ: That is my understanding. One question we were interested in, in CJCA, has been civil defence, and we were represented on the committee of the provincial civil defence headquarters,

I had the pleasure of serving when it was originally organized, and subsequently Mr. Russ Sheppard followed me and we have done a great deal of broadcasting on civil defence and we wondered whether it had made any impression on the people and we were amazed and delighted to know that people would turn to radio in times of emergency.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we will mark that survey as Exhibit 88-A so it will be identified.

EXHIBIT NO. 88-A: Results of survey by Radio Station CJCA Edmonton.

MR. GAETZ: I asked Mr. Clayton, our farm director, to be here if there are any questions you would like to direct to him later on. The members of the staff of CJCA are members of the community in the true sense of the word. They are represented on the executives of the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce, the Edmonton Drama Council, the Alberta Drama Board, the Edmonton Exhibition Association, the Advertising and Sales Executive Club, the University of Alberta Alumni Association, the Canadian Women's Press Club, the S.P.C.A., the John Howard Society, the Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Junior Hospital League, the Women's Symphony Society and the Edmonton Symphony. Staff members are active in service clubs, in church groups, in home and school associations, in reserve military organizations and in theatrical groups.

In this connection it is interesting to note that in one six-week period this spring, CJCA staff members took leading roles in no less than six major theatrical productions in Edmonton.

Today many members of the staff are actively canvassing for funds for the Salvation Army Sunset Homes Appeal.

The foregoing is an outline of CJCA's contribution to the listeners of Northern Alberta. It is our belief that private broadcasting stations should be assured of the widest possible opportunity for expansion of listener services. We believe that the whole question of the power of private stations should be studied and the necessary negotiations be undertaken with the countries concerned, to make possible power increases in order that listeners will be assured of the best possible signal. This is particularly important to stations on the Prairies, serving the vast areas we do.

Such a plan ensures to Canadians the maximum coverage on frequencies assigned to Canada.

This suggestion does not preclude power increases for CBC clear channel stations should such increase be practicable.

I have a letter which I would like to read in this connection, if I may. It is dated March 27, 1956, and addressed to the Edmonton Broadcasting Company Limited, and reads:

"I have listened to CJCA since I was a small boy listening to 'The Farmer'

on a Dayfan radio. Times have certainly changed since then, haven't they? As I remember, the reception of your station was very good then although I cannot recall your wave length of that time. The reception of your station is no longer very good. Some years ago I believe ninety per cent or more of the families in our community regularly tuned to CJCA for most of their programmes. Some of the network programmes like Lux Theatre, etc., have got from CBK because it being much more powerful and in a nearly vacant wave length as far as we are concerned, gave excellent reception.

"In the whole, however, we all listened to you. Your programmes were good, your news coverage and presentation very good. The tonal qualities of the sound we heard was good -- much better than CFTC, CFCN or the present newer CJNB. However, as I stated before, times have changed. Your programmes, news and tone are still very good but the reception of you in our area has deteriorated in the last few years. No longer do most of us listen to CJCA. Many have changed to CBK with its colourless programming, others to CFQC and CJNB with their flat unresonant sound. Away less than half

of our community regular tune to 930
-KC because they cannot expect good
reception any more. Even if you do get
reception there is always a disturbing
background noise.

"I still listen to your station most
of the times and my neighbours would if they
had better reception. We are all Albertans
and our interests lie in Alberta and that is
what we like to keep in touch with. Your
farm director Don Clayton is exceptionally
good. His choice of subjects and locale
is very interesting and informative. When
we market our cattle it is either in Lloyd
or Edmonton and we like to keep track of
Edmonton markets. Your coverage of our
Legislature is of great interest. We
would all like to listen to your station
regularly but many have already left.

"There is only one complaint -- our
reception of you is very, very often too
poor. Electric or battery radios -- good
or poor installations, it makes no differ-
ence. For myself I will hang on till it
gets worse.

"Yours truly,

"James G. Young."

THE CHAIRMAN: Would that be a problem of
interference?

MR. GAETZ: I think so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Has your power been running down in that period?

MR. GAETZ: I think what has been happening, over the years 5000 watts in the early days would cover in the early days, but when we go out and electrify, the local interference has increased so it is not possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: You think it is local interference rather than from a distant powerful station? We heard of a case down in Regina where they had interference from a Mexico station.

MR. GAETZ: I think it is a general increase in the noise level, we have it even here in the city. Finally, Mr. Chairman, we have received hundreds of thank you letters from the various organizations and the people in our community, and I brought them along and I would like to file them with the Commission, if I may. Thank you very much, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I think probably we had better mark these letters as Exhibit 88-B.

EXHIBIT NO. 88-B: Letters from listeners to
Radio Station CJCA.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will send that last exhibit back to our office and read it through there.

MR. GAETZ: I am sorry it was not ready to append to the brief but we ran into printing trouble.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Mr. Gaetz, before going into the detailed subject matter of your brief, I would like to

ask you one or two general questions. You endorse the submission of the CARTB that there should be a separate regulatory board with jurisdiction over both the private and public broadcasting activities, does this mean simply that you want to see the present regulatory powers of the CBC transferred to this separate board or do you recommend that the Act be changed and that some or all of the present powers themselves be abolished altogether?

MR. GAETZ: Well, I think as Mr. C. D. Howe said in the House of Commons, the Radio Act was originally written in the days when radio was primarily a communication for ships at sea. It would seem to me a rewriting of the Act establishing a separate regulatory board for private radio and the CBC would be a useful thing.

MR. COYNE: Do you contemplate that this new regulatory board would have the same powers which the CBC Board of Governors now has, and I am thinking particularly of Sections 20 and 21 of the Broadcasting Act, and Section 20 provides that no private station shall operate as part of a chain or network except with the permission of and in accordance with the regulations made by the Corporation. Then, the Corporation may make the regulations to control and establish chains of networks and so on?

MR. GAETZ: I would think such a regulatory board would have that power. Mind you, a lot of people think we need as little regulation as possible, but certainly a certain amount is necessary.

MR. COYNE: You are not recommending that the control over network broadcasting should be abolished so there would be no control whatsoever over networks?

MR. GAETZ: No, I do not suggest that. As a matter of fact, I think under the present Act, this would be my interpretation of it, that we could operate networks now, it has always been my interpretation of the Act.

MR. COYNE: In other words, there is not an outright prohibition of private networks; it is merely that you have to go to the CBC for permission to operate one?

MR. GAETZ: That is my interpretation of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is correct, and that is the evidence we had in Ottawa, that there was, in fact, some private networks operating; however, on an interim or fairly continuing basis.

MR. GAETZ: This was argued one time before the House of Commons Committee and at that time, as I recall the evidence, the interpretation was that CBC did not have that authority, did not have the authority to grant private networks.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it is fairly clear from the Act now that they have the authority to grant or regulate in that sense.

MR. COYNE: Just dealing with this network question, have you in your own experience, have you ever applied for network facilities, that is, connecting up of private stations in this province

or in Western Canada for the purpose of a network broadcast?

MR. GAETZ: Yes, we have originated shows that have been played to Calgary and Lethbridge.

MR. COYNE: That is not originating to one of the CBC networks?

MR. GAETZ: I presume they call it a supplementary network.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But you never applied for a continuous permit to operate a network? This would be a specific case?

MR. GAETZ: We operated a network for some years for market quotations for western grain dealers, and it subsequently went to one of the other stations. We have never, to answer your question specifically, I do not think we have ever applied directly for a continuous network as such.

MR. COYNE: Do you know of any instances or are there any instances of significance where you have applied for these network facilities and have been turned down? I think perhaps you should exclude occasions where the programme was a political speech or had some political overtones which brought it within the political broadcasting regulations; aside from that --- ?

MR. GAETZ: That gets it into a debatable question of whether it is political or not.

MR. COYNE: Perhaps it does, but, leaving aside programmes which might rightly or wrongly have been considered political, do you recall any

instances where you have applied for network facilities and been denied them?

MR. GAETZ: I do not think so. As a matter of fact, we were discussing that today, and some years ago, it sticks in my mind, but I cannot find any documents so it should not be introduced as evidence, it was a matter of putting a commentator on a western network, and as I recall it was refused, but I think it would be unfair to enter it as evidence because we do not have the documentary proof.

MR. COYNE: Just on the general question, there has been considerable comment before the Commission on the possibility of developing private networks at the present time as an additional national radio network operated on a purely commercial basis; in your judgment is that a practical business proposition, in competition with the CBC networks?

MR. GAETZ: Oh, I think so, but I would not think you could undertake to operate sixteen or eighteen hours a day, I think you could operate a national network for perhaps four hours a day to start with.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Would you think it was feasible if the CBC with their network were untangled and were allowed to compete commercially and operate more or less on the same lines as a private station; would it include all programmes?

MR. GAETZ: Well, if there is a limiting factor, in my personal opinion the structure of the CBC is to regulate and a private network setting up

to compete with them, I think they could afford to make regional discounts, and I think in many cases they would set the price too low, so a private network would have this to overcome, but I think it could be done.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you leave that, I wanted to go back to the separate regulatory board which you are suggesting in your brief. You know one of our problems is to look into the financial costs which are mounting for the CBC and for radio generally, I suppose, and television. Obviously a separate regulatory body is going to increase costs somewhat, the amount exactly is not too easy to estimate, but what exactly do you expect to get from a separate regulatory body? Is it purely a matter of principle or is it some practical thing that you would want to achieve?

MR. GAETZ: Well, I think it is a matter of principle. I go back to the early days of radio. I started in 1929 when it was really a toy. We had the Aird Commission and there was a good deal of confusion existed in our minds, and, as a matter of fact, in the early days we just assumed we were going to be taken over and that would be the end of it, but in point of fact the industry has developed over the years. In 1947, I could be wrong on the date, our licences were granted for three years; I think in 1952, for five years, and it seems to me that the licence should be granted in perpetuity subject to recall for misuse. I would feel better if I was

dealing with a separate regulatory body who had no interest in broadcasting.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is precisely the kind of evidence we have had from several people, private broadcasters, they would feel better and they finally admit it is largely a matter of fear or apprehension of some kind in their own minds. They have not so far -- you have not pointed to any oppressive action by the CBC or even any regulations that you seriously quarrel with. Now, I think it is a real question as to extra cost, apart from everything else, of \$75,000 or \$100,000 a year to operate a separate regulatory board, by the Government, by public treasury, in order to make you feel better.

MR. GAETZ: Well, it seems to me we are really just in a whole new phase of broadcasting with television, with the whole electronic field, and it has advanced substantially in the last twenty-five years and it certainly must have a tremendous future and I would think that the CBC themselves would like it not to be saddled with what is obviously going to develop into a very extensive matter of granting of frequency of one kind or another and the use of them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, let us divide the two kinds of regulation; there is the matter of licensing and the technological developments which are coming forward, and the question of power and interference and that kind of thing, which even at the moment are vested in the Department of Transport, in which the CBC's advice is taken, but the decision

is made by the Government of Canada. Take the other side, the kind of regulation which goes to the question of operation as presently stated in the statute of a national broadcasting system which, as put to us, was a system which had grown up, as you yourself lived through it, of a central government body, but also private stations integrated into the national service. Now, that kind of regulation is an operating regulation as distinct from a licensing regulation. Do you think as a practical matter that type of operating regulation can be separated from the CBC and vested in a separate regulatory body and at the same time still retain a national broadcasting system?

MR. GAETZ: Oh, I think so, because my experience with the integration of the private station on the network has been in the main by agreement; I do not have to be on a network if I do not want to be, and most of us have been on the networks at one time or another but it was not regulation, I do not think.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if the regulation had not been an important factor in this field of operations, had it been a matter of mutual agreement, what in that sphere different would you get from an independent regulatory body?

MR. GAETZ: Well, it is my feeling, sir, having been on the network, we have had our differences with the CBC over different matters, and I would feel as a broadcaster a little better if I did not have to deal with them on one hand on rates and other problems and then over here they are the people who are

granting the licence and power increases -- I have the feeling, that feeling of being arbitrary on the commercial level and in the future we had to apply for a licence in Edmonton and we were turned down and the licence was granted to another station. I have often wondered if there was any connection between the CBC being the operating body and the people recommending licences; I would have felt better about it if it had been a separate board that granted it but had no interest in programming.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But in this case a television station in Edmonton is not a CBC station, is it?

MR. GAETZ: No.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: So they arbitrated between two private applications?

MR. GAETZ: Well, little more than arbitrated, originally it was suggested that we, as I recall -- the suggestion came -- I cannot point to the time, but Mr. Dunton suggested on occasions that the stations join together for a private station, as happened in Calgary and Hamilton; we organized a joint company of three broadcasting stations, applied for the station. We were not successful in getting it. Two of us went along together and the other one got the licence -- it seems to me the CBC is in an embarrassing position having to arbitrate between us and the man down the street.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Someone has to do it and since they are not an applicant but have a

knowledge of television, they are in a better position than some person who has no technical knowledge to make the decision.

MR. GAETZ: Well, I am assuming that the separate regulatory body would have the necessary technical people ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gaetz, there is nothing in the way of change in the present system, a great change that you would expect to obtain from a separate regulatory body, but it is more that it is a matter of feeling, of principle, there is something you think you could get out of a separate regulatory body that you cannot get out of the CBC?

MR. GAETZ: Well, we hope when the next television lease comes up we would have a chance, and I wonder if under this system we would.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: How many channels are open in Edmonton?

MR. GAETZ: I think there are eleven or twelve and two hundred UHF channels.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Oh, well, UHF is pretty much in the future, is it not?

MR. GAETZ: I would say so.

MR. COYNE: It is just a feeling, I think you said, that if the television channels are opened up that you would have a better chance to get a licence from an independent board than from a CBC Board?

MR. GAETZ: That is my feeling.

MR. COYNE: Just pursuing one point I was on earlier, the regulatory board contained in Section

21, we have discussed networks; then there is a board to make regulations regarding reserved time, controlling the character and nature of all programmes of broadcast by the Corporation or private stations, to control the proportion of time that may be devoted to advertising, control the character of such advertising, and the time that may be devoted to political broadcasts and the assignment of time on an equitable basis, and the greater use of Canadian talent for Canadian private stations, and so on, I take it from what you say you are not specifically recommending any changes in these regulatory boards but simply the transference of the regulations from the CBC Board to a separate board?

MR. GAETZ: I do not agree with them all, but I would like to wrangle with a separate board and not the CBC.

MR. COYNE: But you are not suggesting the CBC should not have the power to make the same regulations?

MR. GAETZ: I would think so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just to correct the record on the question of the available television channels in Edmonton, you mentioned eleven or twelve. Mr. Gaetz, according to the present distribution of channels by international agreement there are only three channels open for Edmonton in addition to Channel 3 which now exists. I just did not want anyone thinking there were eleven or twelve channels open, because there are not under the

present distribution.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Gaetz, just turning to another rather general point in your summary, you say:

"It is our belief that private broadcasting stations should be assured of the widest possible opportunity for expansion of listener services."

I wonder if you could expand a little on how you think they should be assured of the widest possible opportunity for expansion of services?

MR. GAETZ: Well, as I said earlier, sir, we have gradually -- I speak for myself -- as I say, we started in the business when it looked like we were not going to be here very long, but we have gone on now at CJCA and I think from the brief we have read to you that we have provided quite extensive services, and I would like to go on and continue to do this. I think one of the things in that connection, providing better service, is increased power, which, as you probably are aware, under present international agreement we are limited in Canada. I think that power, wherever necessary, should be increased to provide service, I think the listeners are entitled to the maximum service of as many stations as they can get.

MR. COYNE: Apart from the increased power, are there any factors operating at present which you feel prevent you from enjoying the widest possible

opportunity for expansion of your service? Is there something limiting your opportunity for expansion at the moment that should be changed?

MR. GAETZ: Well, as we discussed earlier, I think that we in Alberta could get into regional networks and perhaps expand them.

MR. COYNE: Is there any reason why you could not do that now? Have you applied for regional network service?

MR. GAETZ: Well, I would have to check this, too. Apparently the only one having a network is CBC, in point of fact it is not, but I would think if you were going to establish a network you would promote it and sell it, it would be ours and we would operate it.

MR. COYNE: But you have never applied for such a network under the present regulations?

MR. GAETZ: No, not a permanent network.

MR. COYNE: So that you have never been turned down?

MR. GAETZ: Not for a specific network.

MR. COYNE: One of the arguments that we had in, I think it was, Winnipeg, and it related to television too -- I think it may be relevant here -- they were complaining about only having one television station in Winnipeg and it was a CBC station, and the substance of their complaint was that the CBC station was unable to give local community service to the City of Winnipeg because of its network commitments, that is, its national commitments, and the suggestion was made that a private station

operating as a local community station could fill that gap. Now, if private stations were to form networks would not that same factor interfere with their local community services?

MR. GAETZ: I do not think it would. We performed all these community services over the years, being a network station of the CBC, carrying both their sustaining and commercial programmes. It might be we would sell to a sponsor certain of these shows. If I can produce dramatic shows in Edmonton and get a sponsor to buy them I see nothing wrong with that, and it is still a public service.

MR. COYNE: In point of fact, in radio how much of the broadcasting week is taken up with network programmes? Is it a major factor in terms of time or a relatively minor thing?

MR. GAETZ: It would vary whether you were on the Trans-Canada or Dominion and your commitments for sustaining commitments -- we are not allowed to carry sustaining service -- I think the figures here are network commercial in the week of January 31st, thirteen hours and fifteen minutes for the week.

THE CHAIRMAN: Out of 110 or 112 hours?

MR. GAETZ: Out of 132 hours.

MR. COYNE: And is that the sort of commitment that you have in mind when you speak of network broadcasting? I mean, something in the neighbourhood of twelve or fifteen hours a week?

MR. GAETZ: Well, I would not like to commit myself on that point; there is only -- there will only

be on a regional network in Alberta, there will only be a reasonably small number of sponsors who are interested in buying total Alberta coverage.

MR. COYNE: If this is such a desirable thing why has there never been an application to form a regional network?

MR. GAETZ: Most of us do it by tape right today.

MR. COYNE: So it is possible to get the advantage of distributing costs through syndication?

MR. GAETZ: That is right. It was not really a permanent operation in the early days of transcriptions; in my experience they were too hard to make. We can now make a show on tape in Edmonton and distribute it to Grande Prairie and the tape is salvaged and used again.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I ask a question there? Does this possibly mean that the regional network is a less desirable thing, that it is achieved just as well, and perhaps more economically, by the use of tapes? In other words, is the desire for regional networks perhaps waning?

MR. GAETZ: Oh, I would think so. A great deal of what we do now we do on tape.

MR. COYNE: And you are doing that now?

MR. GAETZ: We have one show on which, if there are sports commentators from Toronto, Hamilton, Regina, Calgary, Vancouver or Winnipeg, I do not suggest we use them all, but we get tapes from them each week and we send them tapes.

MR. COYNE: What I find difficult, Mr. Gaetz, is the fact that apparently these things are being done now, there is syndication through tapes, it is apparently possible to arrange regional network tie-ups, and my difficulty is to see what else you expect to be able to do under some alternative set-up. In other words, what in fact are the inhibiting factors that the present system of regulation imposes upon you?

MR. GAETZ: The one I was thinking of, supposing I wanted to put a commentator over the province. With the present Act, as I understand it, I cannot. I can do it by tape as long as I do not put it on a network; if I put him on at Edmonton at six o'clock I do not have to go on Calgary at nine, and so on.

MR. COYNE: This is something we have not heard much about.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you ever asked to have a commentator on?

MR. GAETZ: There was one case, but I do not have the documentation on it.

MR. COYNE: But your understanding is, as far as a commentator is concerned, you cannot arrange a simultaneous broadcast?

MR. GAETZ: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you cannot do it unless you get permission?

MR. COYNE: Well, I think Mr. Gaetz means that they or others have applied for permission and have been denied it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just on this point, the letter which you read from the newspaper as part of your main presentation, which I thought you were quoting with apparent approval, there was one phrase I picked up where it says something about, "if unhampered by governmental regulation". Can you find that part?

MR. GAETZ: Yes, "I am sure, Mr. Editor, that private broadcasters have realized their responsibilities and could continue to expand their efforts if unhampered by governmental regulation."

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the point, and along the line of Mr. Coyne's question, how can you expand your operations and to what extent are they hampered today in such expansion? You mentioned the one case of putting a commentator on, for which you have to get permission.

MR. GAETZ: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: But which you can accomplish by means of a delayed tape recording. My point is this, Mr. Gaetz, in your brief you show a very considerable achievement as a private station, that is what your brief was set up to do and it did it very completely. How would you have been able to do any more?

MR. GAETZ: Well, I cannot answer that immediately. We are going to set out to try and do more panel discussions and so on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me ask you this, assuming you are always hoping to do better, to

what extent have you been hampered by government regulations? What I am trying to get at is, it is the easiest thing in the world for people to say, "Oh, government regulation is a bad thing", but the real test is whether or not there has been any interference with the fullest possible measure of these services which you have outlined early in your brief; have you been interfered with at all?

MR. GAETZ: I do not think so, sir, really that is the truth of the matter.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Gaetz, I am turning to a different point and then I would like to ask you one or two questions on the matter. One of the points that has been raised quite frequently before the Commission is the inherent danger or the danger in principle of permitting a government body to control or regulate a medium of communication, that is, such things as news and information; does the CBC exercise any control at all over your broadcasts of news or comment?

MR. GAETZ: I think not. In the early days of network we, as a basic station, had to carry CBC newscasts at periods-- that was part of the network agreement -- when I thought the broadcasts should have been of local interest.

MR. COYNE: But apart from the CBC newscasts, your own newscasts and your own comment, the contents of those is within your own authority?

MR. GAETZ: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does Mr. Sheppard wish to

add anything to that?

MR. SHEPPARD: No, sir.

MR. GAETZ: There is one question, the matter of the limitation under the CBC Act where we cannot do broadcasting 48 hours preceding an election, and you have a situation where as recently as in the last election the Premier made a statement which was a very interesting one, but our interpretation of the Act -- and it is my understanding the CBC's interpretation -- prohibited us from using the statement because it was in fact a political statement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course, that is a statute that is passed by Parliament for, no doubt, reasons of peace and good order.

MR. GAETZ: But you get into the position as to what statement by the Premier is political and what is not.

MR. COYNE: That is not something that the CBC is concerned with.

THE CHAIRMAN: Except they are equally bound by it.

MR. COYNE: I mean, the fact you cannot broadcast it rises from the statute.

MR. GAETZ: Well, the CBC brings this to our attention each election time in their documents.

THE CHAIRMAN: They probably want to prevent you going to jail.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Gaetz, turning to your brief, on page 2 you say, in the last paragraph:

"We do view with alarm the

apparent lack of sales effort to maintain the networks, and it may be that, in years to come, 'tape' or 'transcriptions' may ultimately replace most commercial networks ---"

I wonder if you could expand a little on what you feel is the apparent lack of sales effort?

MR. GAETZ: The night time network has disappeared -- there may be one or two shows -- two or three shows at night time, and the day time network has disappeared at a great speed, and I feel that with the advertisers the CBC Sales Department has made no real effort to repossess that business.

MR. COYNE: Does this apply to both the Dominion and the Trans-Canada networks?

MR. GAETZ: I would think so.

MR. COYNE: But you feel there may be more imagination and effort put into maintaining these networks?

MR. GAETZ: I get the idea they persuaded all their advertisers to swing over to television. I do not want to myself, but my boy tells me that.

MR. COYNE: Turning to the next page, page 3, you mention the surveys over a period of years indicate that three of the private commercial stations among them share approximately ninety per cent of the listening audience; do you regard the size of the listening audience as a final and conclusive test as to the value of the programmes?

MR. GAETZ: Well, we have spent a good deal of time trying to attract as large an audience

as we can and get as many radio sets turned on, and we have depended on the surveys to give us that indication.

MR. COYNE: But the sort of thing I had in mind would be this, that you might have one hundred thousand people listening to the fights from Madison Square Garden and only ten thousand people listening to the symphony from Toronto, but you would not say that necessarily means the fights are better than the Toronto Symphony. The CJCA Players, are they a professional group?

MR. GAETZ: No, sir, they are made up of local doctors, lawyers, housewives, people who are interested in dramatics and have done it for the pleasure and the interest they have in it. Mr. Homersham, our director, may be able to give you some further information.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there anything you wish to add?

MR. HOMERSHAM: What was the question?

MR. COYNE: I was asking whether the Players were a professional group and Mr. Gaetz said they were a group of people who have a love of the theatre.

MR. HOMERSHAM: That is right. Unfortunately in a city this size there is no possibility of a person devoting all their time to that talent, they have to work as well.

MR. COYNE: But you do maintain them as an organized group?

MR. HOMERSHAM: Very definitely.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you pay them?

MR. HOMERSHAM: You may say a token payment is given to them.

MR. GAETZ: If I may add to that, when they are on sustaining we have a fee we have arrived at that is satisfactory to them and us; when we can sell commercially they get the maximum fee possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just wanted to clear it as to whether they were professional or amateur; they are part-time professionals in a sense?

MR. HOMERSHAM: I think you can classify them as that, yes.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 9 where you sum up your section on talent, you say:

"We believe that by giving leadership and direct financial assistance to groups supporting the 'Living Theatre' in Edmonton and Northern Alberta as a whole, through the medium of radio promotion and publicity, one of the basic fundamentals of the development and furtherance of creative talent can be realized."

I presume you mean there are more ways than actually staging programmes by professional talent by which radio can actually promote and encourage the development of talent?

MR. GAETZ: You notice the number of groups there are in Edmonton, they are all doing reasonably well, and our organization and the others have been

extensive in our promotion of these groups to encourage them.

MR. COYNE: And that is a definite help to them in establishing themselves in the community?

MR. GAETZ: Yes, I do not think they could do it without us, as a matter of fact.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Could I interject a question there? A question has come up on different occasions as to whether or not there is sufficient talent in this country to provide good entertainment on the radio sufficient for, say, sixteen hours a day on the two networks, and you feel that a private network is economically possible; have you any views on the question of whether or not there is sufficient talent in this country to carry programmes that would be up to what one might expect, reasonably good programmes?

MR. GAETZ: Well, I think the talent has developed over the years and will continue to develop; I would see no difficulty in developing more talent.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, then, the next question to that has come up, talent is available; I think most of the operators agree with that, but then come the creative talents -- have we enough script writers to provide the vehicles for the talent to operate in and still keep reasonably high standards of programmes?

MR. GAETZ: I think there is a tremendous shortage of script writers, but, again, they are developing and television has shown the lack of

these people.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: So you do not think that despite the shortage of script writers that that would interfere with the economics of an additional network?

MR. GAETZ: I do not think so.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Or detract from the nature of the programmes that would go over the air?

MR. GAETZ: I think we can develop lots of script writers; as a matter of fact, we should have started earlier. I am losing a top man soon who is going east to free lance and he is a real writer, and I would like to see him in the east where he can expand his talent.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Gaetz, why do the Edmonton Symphony and the Edmonton Pops Concerts not want their concerts broadcast? I think you mentioned that before?

MR. GAETZ: I would like to refer that to Mr. Homersham, who has been responsible for that.

MR. HOMERSHAM: Mr. Chairman, that has been discussed with both the groups, the Edmonton Symphony and the Pops Concert people to some considerable extent, and it was felt that radio's participation was largely to get the crowd to the concerts, and that is why it has been done on that basis. We have given the public an appreciation of the performance following a performance itself, and it is sent out the night following the concert, they have heard what they have missed, and it has been an incentive for them to go out to the following concert, and I

think it has proved very satisfactory.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is the same reason I cannot see the Montreal Alouettes when they are playing in Montreal.

MR. GAETZ: If you buy a season ticket to a football game or a symphony, if you can get them to lay their money down in advance, then that problem disappears.

MR. COYNE: Just one last question, Mr. Gaetz: on page 10 you are describing your programming and you are talking about a programme called "Shirley Speaking" and you say:

"In cases of emergency, Shirley's programme has been used to obtain blood donors -- transportation for crippled children -- drives for clothing and funds."

Are any of these drives for clothing and for funds subject to a consent in writing of a representative of the Corporation under Regulation 5G?

MR. GAETZ: I would think the funds would be.

MR. COYNE: Do you know whether that consent has ever been refused or whether there has ever been any difficulty?

MR. GAETZ: I might be in trouble for this, but we have not asked for it.

MR. COYNE: And you have never been in trouble yet?

MR. GAETZ: Well, there is some question about that.

MR. COYNE: Those are all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I wonder if you would care to express any opinion on the future of radio, with the advent of television, what is the possibility of the future of radio?

MR. GAETZ: Quickly, my feeling is that radio is going to go on and expand and develop. I think a good many of the things we are doing we may have to change, we may have to find new approaches, but certainly my feeling is that radio is going to get bigger, more people are going to use it.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is a continuing different function from television?

MR. GAETZ: Oh, yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: At the moment, from the briefs we have heard, there seems to be a feeling that radio has lost its commercial value in the evening hours; do you think that will continue and radio will have the day and television the evening hours, or ---

MR. GAETZ: I do not think radio has lost any of its impact. Our sales department is checking on that.

MR. COYNE: Do you feel that radio will gather some of the audience which apparently it has lost in the evening hours in the heavily saturated television areas?

MR. GAETZ: I would think so. Assuming that we do not recover more, there are still lots of

sets to be turned on, we still have a tremendous potential.

MR. COYNE: But you will have to persuade them to turn on their radio sets rather than the television sets?

MR. GAETZ: We devote our time to this.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have one or two questions. On page 1 of your brief -- this is a question you will feel free not to answer if you do not want to, but you do note on page 1 that the two owner companies of the Edmonton Broadcasting Company are public companies and as such their shares are widely held. I wonder should it also be noted that these two companies have also extensive interests in other radio and television stations throughout Canada, and the Southam Company has a station in Hamilton, two in Calgary and one in Edmonton. Taylor, Pearson & Carson (Canada) Limited have stations elsewhere. Now, the case has been put to us, and we are trying to get the facts, that there is a danger in having various media of communication, newspaper, radio and television, under a common ownership. Have you any comments on that from your experience in radio, or are there practical advantages arising from such a common ownership? In other words, we are looking for -- this case has been put to us and we are looking to see what the facts are.

MR. GAETZ: I think it would be unfair of me to comment on the ownership. I think as far as Taylor, Pearson & Carson, the information if it

has not been supplied to you, will be, and I think it would be unfair for me to comment on the Southam interests. I understand they will present a brief themselves. It has been our experience in the matter of our operation in developing programme ideas, developing and moving people around, giving them a chance, in this way we have found it to be a very useful thing. A great many of our people have gone on through our organization and become station managers; they might have done it on their own, but we find it very useful and a very practical way to operate.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Let us put it the other way, there is no pressure put on you as a manager of a station to spark plug any particular fancies of the newspapers owners?

MR. GAETZ: I have had the pleasure of operating in several privately owned stations in Winnipeg, Regina and here, and I do not recall one single instance where an owner has suggested to me a policy.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I think that is what we want to get at. I would judge from the answers we have heard that there is a fear abroad of the different media of communication owned by one party, that they might use that as a means of propaganda, and I am most interested to hear, as I expected I would hear, that there was no particular pressure put on.

MR. GAETZ: The only reference I make to

my Board of Directors is on capital expenses, and if it is more than \$2,000 I refer that to them, but the policy of the station is decided by the people you have met this morning and by myself. We meet every Thursday morning and figure out the policy, and that is it.

THE CHAIRMAN: You see, when points are put to us we have to try and get at the facts in case we have to deal with it in our report, and that is the purpose of the question.

MR. GAETZ: Oh, I appreciate the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then, on page 3 of your brief -- you may have answered this to Mr. Coyne -- near the bottom you say, talking about the objective of your station to provide service in the community, and you say:

"In order to do this, we must
supply as many listeners as possible
with what they want to hear . . ."

That is a statement that is capable of possibly several interpretations, and I am anxious to have you expand on it if you can. Do you really mean it in the sense of the word that it is the greatest will of the greatest number that you are trying to meet? Before I go on, shall I give you the full question? Take the analogy of a newspaper where there is probably a longer tradition operating, you cannot help but wonder on a popular vote how many editorial columns would win out, how many of the better columnists and experts would get a majority vote.

They might get a minority vote, but any good newspaper worthy of the name, having editorial columns and several commentators to meet these minority needs, are you here saying that it is the majority test with individuals or is it a balanced broad programme that you have in mind?

MR. GAETZ: Well, it is a balanced broad programme. I was pointing out the sort of thing we had with the young people. This was a new experiment with us. My plan would be, over the years, to try and introduce the kind of broadcasting that would get public opinion on the air. Now, part of our problem has been technique. We did a series here not long ago, perhaps two or three years ago, and it was a complete failure, but I blame the technique we used, I think we could go back and develop a technique, and I am prepared to broadcast it when I find the technique that will interest the most people.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is what I thought you meant, but reading this it could have the other meaning.

MR. GAETZ: There are certain things I would not broadcast; I am opposed to request programmes as such, you just get into the same thing day after day after day and there are certain things we just would not broadcast.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well then, this is slightly different, but a similar question: do you as an operator on a commercial radio station try to sell all of the time you can in your station or is there a top limit? This is somewhat again analogous to

the tradition in newspapers of a portion between paid and unpaid content.

MR. GAETZ: Well, I was hoping to sell it all. I can see important information broadcasts of these young people that would be your newspaper roundup, I cannot see that sponsorship in any way changes the programmes, and we do not allow a sponsor to have control over programmes, he will buy it as we are going to broadcast it or he will not buy it at all, so I do not think it makes any difference if we can go on and develop these things and find sponsors and sell them; I do not think it spoils things. It has the advantage that the sponsor will probably promote it as well as ourselves.

THE CHAIRMAN: You do not feel there should be a proportion that is your own independent proportion of the total publication for the day?

MR. GAETZ: Well, I consider that everything we broadcast is ours, our news and the features that we have we design at CJCA, and nobody can interfere with it but ourselves.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have sponsored news?

MR. GAETZ: Oh, indeed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any interference at all from the sponsor in the character of the news or any interfering in the character of the news?

MR. GAETZ: I have never in my life had a sponsor say we should delete or change.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have mentioned in your brief here where the exact opposite took place,

where you refrained from interfering where it may have been desirable. Now, one last question ---

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Before you go on to the next point, you brought out a rather interesting point in which you say you will not allow the sponsor to interfere with the programme at all; I think from my point of view I would like a little clarification of that, if an advertising agency brought in a programme to you would you permit them to put that on the air if it met with your standards of broadcasting?

MR. GAETZ: I think that is right. I was speaking primarily ---

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Because otherwise we will get the impression that you are the sole producer.

MR. GAETZ: I would not like to leave that impression with you; I apologize for that.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I was inclined to think that might have been read into your reply and I thought we had better clarify it.

MR. GAETZ: We have turned down shows from national advertisers which we did not like.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I know, but if they brought a show to you which you thought was good enough to put on the air, would you still permit that?

MR. GAETZ: Oh, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have one or two more questions. This next one is on page 4, where you mention the dual role of community servant and

community leader, and you make, as I have said, a very well-founded case as to what your station has done in these two or one field of community service. What I would like to ask you is this, is this complete statement of the private radio station's function? We have had it put to us in a number of briefs that there is a function for broadcasting, variously described as a national service tying together the different areas of culture of Canada, building a national consciousness and that sort of thing. First of all, do you think that is a proper function of the CBC, irrespective of how it comes to be, and, if so, should private stations participate in that national function as distinct from the community function?

MR. GAETZ: Well, in the first place, I think CBC has done an excellent job in the national field; we are not allowed to participate in any phase of it at the moment, we are not allowed to carry sustaining shows, we are a supplementary station, and we have devoted our efforts to doing relatively the same thing in the community or the province.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, even within your own local area is there a function a private station can discharge in telling the people of the Edmonton area something about the history of French Canada, the history of British Columbia, the attitude or thinking across the country, apart altogether from the sustaining programmes of the national sort? What I am really trying to say to you, with all the value

and emphasis that has been placed on community service, is there not in fact something you maybe are doing now but if not maybe should be doing on private stations in the national sphere?

MR. GAETZ: We have done this in sports; I would hope we could go on and develop the same thing in other fields where we might exchange tapes with stations in Ontario, Quebec and the Maritimes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was really going back to your answer to Mr. Stewart about the changing role in radio and the way in which it could develop with the advent of television, and it seems to me that the emphasis from the private stations has been placed very much on the community service with very little reference at all to participating in the national function of broadcast.

MR. GAETZ: I think we will come to that. What I would like to do is develop our service so we have for Alberta with other stations what the CBC is doing for Canada, and then we could extend from there.

THE CHAIRMAN: One final point. We have been trying to run down the claim that there is competition between the CBC and private radio stations, apart from competition for listeners, do you feel that you compete in Edmonton with the CBC stations?

MR. GAETZ: I think, first of all, the competition for listeners is a good thing on the basis that they should get the maximum service. We compete with the CBC at the national level for a

certain amount of commercials. I think we should be in competition with them for the use of frequencies. This is possible, if they want I would like to think they are only using 100 watts on this area, and if they are not going to extend that service to serve the maximum number of people I would like to have it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think a good bit of competition is a good thing?

MR. GAETZ: Oh, sure, it keeps us alert.

THE CHAIRMAN: And they also compete for local advertising?

MR. GAETZ: Oh, I complained about it to the Massey Commission, but looking back on it I do not care basically; if everybody is selling radio as a medium we have to stand or fall on that basis. We will get our share.

THE CHAIRMAN: At the moment I understand there is no competition for local advertising in radio by CBC?

MR. GAETZ: I do not think so, and if they were maintain a rate structure comparable with our other stations I am prepared to take anybody on.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Do you think their rates are low?

MR. GAETZ: The network, I think, is too low, I have always thought so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Gaetz. We have taken you a little far afield from your brief.

MR. GAETZ: I have enjoyed it, sir, and

thank you very much for the opportunity to appear before you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will go on with the next brief.

SUBMISSION OF CFAC CALGARY

THE CHAIRMAN: We will mark your brief as Exhibit No. 89.

EXHIBIT NO. 89: Brief submitted by CFAC Calgary.

MR. CAIRNS: My brief is fairly short and I would like to read it. May I apologize in advance for much of the ground which has come out of your questioning of Mr. Gaetz is contained in this.

"May I take this opportunity of thanking the Commission for its courtesy in affording me this opportunity of appearing before it, and to assure the Commissioners that my sole purpose in requesting this opportunity is a sincere desire to be, perhaps, of some little help to them in their difficult deliberations.

"I have the honour to represent before you today broadcasting station CFAC, of the City of Calgary. CFAC, while not the oldest established independent radio station in Canada, certainly must number among the first dozen or so, since it was established, and first went on the air, on May 2nd, 1922. For over thirty-four years CFAC has been working in the interests of

Calgary and southern Alberta, and can, I think, look back over that third of a century with justifiable pride, while at the same time looking forward to the next thirty-four years with confidence and optimism.

"My purpose in appearing before you today is twofold. First, to tell you briefly of some of the things which we do at CFAC which seem to enhance us in the opinion of our listeners, and secondly to reiterate our support, already conveyed to you by letter, of the brief which has been presented to you by the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters. It is, perhaps, the reputed nature of Calgarians to be optimistic, but I think we are no different than any other good Canadians in being optimistic about the eventual change, in a democratic society such as ours is, of a situation fundamentally undemocratic. For such is our view of the situation in radio and television in Canada today. So we believe, together with the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, that some separate authority, other than the CBC, should license and control radio and television in Canada. In taking this position, I must make it very clear, that our stand is prompted through a matter of principle, and is in no way intended to reflect on the sincerity or ability of the men and women who go to make up the CBC. Over the years we have come into frequent contact with

various officials of the Corporation, and have found them to be high-principled and reasonable individuals. This, of course, is a tribute to the men of the CBC, rather than the framework of the law in which they must operate. Our quarrel is in no sense with the Corporation as such, or with its personnel, but with the fact that in our opinion the Broadcasting Act . . . a statute which we feel to be antiquated in the light of present day conditions . . . places the Corporation and its officers in an untenable position, when viewed against the broad background of democratic ideals and simple justice.

"Permit me now to place before you some information concerning the current activities of CFAC. From the small beginnings of 34 years ago CFAC has grown from a low powered, almost experimental station with a staff of two or three, to a modern, fully equipped broadcasting station, operating with a staff of some fifty well trained and highly qualified broadcasters from a series of up-to-date studios and offices. The station's power is 5000 watts, the maximum permissible under international agreement for the frequency we occupy. Our operating schedule is a minimum of 18 hours a day every day. As the manager of this radio station, I conceive my chief responsibilities to be three in number. First, to our listeners. I believe we should try to operate CFAC in a manner that will afford a

wide variety of entertainment, and information to the community which we serve, reflecting, in so far as possible, and being part of, the life of that community. My second responsibility, I think, is to our staff, and I believe they should be provided with the best working conditions, the best tools to do the work, and the best wages consistent with the work done that we can afford. Finally, I am responsible to the board of directors of the Calgary Broadcasting Company to attempt to operate the station in a manner which will reflect credit on the company, and at a profit.

"The prime responsibility, in my opinion, is to the listeners. And that responsibility is discharged through the programmes which we broadcast, and the part we play as a station and as individuals in the life of our community. We're quite proud of our programmes at CFAC, and, I think, with some reason. We have ten awards decorating the halls at CFAC, which our programmes have won for us in national and international competitions. Three of these are awards from the Ohio State University Institute for Education by Radio-Television. We have two Beaver awards, which are of Canadian origin, one for programming and one for engineering. We have a Canadian Radio Award won in 1952 for the work done by our drama director and his weekly live-talent 'Radio Workshop' series. We have a certificate of award from the

Advertising Association of the West for
' . . . notable achievement in Radio Advertising'.
We have a Billboard Magazine first place award
in North American competition for 'promotion of
radio as a medium', we have a Showmanagement
award from Variety, the trade paper of the enter-
tainment world, and we have a National Safety
Council Public Interest Award.

"Of course, we have many programmes which have
won no awards. So has any radio station . . . or
network, for that matter. But the absence of
awards in no way lessens the effectiveness or
necessity of such programmes. Our news depart-
ment, for instance, day in and day out produces
factual, informative newscasts, prepared and
broadcast by a six man staff, augmented by a
system of country correspondents and three
news-wire services. The newswire copy, inci-
dentally, is virtually 100 per cent rewritten by
our newsmen before broadcasting it, thus minimi-
zing any potential 'propaganda' slant, which
point of view was aired before this Commission
recently. In addition to the daily job of
newscasts, our news department prepares and
presents two news features which we consider to
be quite noteworthy. One, which has just con-
cluded its first season's run was developed in
cooperation with the John Howard Society, and
involved actual broadcast interviews with ex-
convicts who were in the process of rehabilitation.

The John Howard Society was kind enough to speak very glowingly of the value of this series to them and to the whole problem of placing the ex-convict in a useful niche in society. The other news feature, which has been running for some years now, five nights a week, is a quarter hour titled 'Talk of the Town'. This involves recorded interviews with anyone and everyone who is currently newsworthy. One man spends his entire day arranging the interviews, then the whole series of recordings is edited, put together with a bridging narrative into a fifteen minute programme, and released at 10.15, following the 10 p.m. news. In the fall of last year, 'Talk of the Town' completed its 3000th interview, and is now well on its way to the 4000th. On Sunday nights, in Calgary, we present an hour of some of the most informative listening on the air anywhere. At 8 p.m. we have one of our feature newscasts of the day, followed at 8.10 by a roundup of sports scores. At 8.15 we present 'This Week', a dramatized quarter hour of the news highlights of the preceding week, produced by our drama director, and featuring our Radio Workshop Players as the artists. This programme, incidentally, won us two of our three Ohio State University awards. At 8.30 we present Ernest Watkins in a commentary on the news of the week. Mr. Watkins is an English barrister

who recently came to Canada to settle. Before coming here, he was for seven years a featured news analyst heard over the British Broadcasting Corporation, and the news analyses which he presents each Sunday evening for us over CFAC are among the best that can be heard anywhere. Following Mr. Watkins, we conclude the hour with the quarter hour program 'Report from Parliament Hill', a nationwide feature which I think has already been brought to your attention. All in all, we think, an hour of first-rate serious and informative listening. Parts of it are sponsored -- parts are not. The important thing to us is that the hour is there.

"We have a different type of women's programme on the air five afternoons each week. It is simply dedicated to the proposition that the woman in the home wants more to listen to than recipes, movie gossip and light chit-chat. This programme is designed to be stimulating and provocative, and from the moment it went on the air it has received high critical acclaim. One Calgary newspaper reviewer described it as '... the best women's programme I have ever heard'. It probably isn't that good, but it does give the women of southern Alberta something to listen to that won't insult their intelligence. Right now, this particular programme is about to present the case of a negro woman in Calgary, who can't rent an

apartment just because she is a negro. I think before we're through with this case two things will have happened. First, the woman will have an apartment. And second, and perhaps more important, there'll be a few sharply pricked consciences around Calgary, and considerably less smugness in contemplation of racial problems in other parts of the world.

"I have used these few illustrations in an attempt to bring out what to me is a very salient, and often far too overlooked, fact. This fact is that no one broadcasting system is all good or all bad -- or, in terms of programming all popular or all serious. Too many organizations in this country, I fear, can see none of the shadings between black and white. They feel that all independently owned stations see nothing but the possibility of making money, while a publicly owned broadcasting system is the only guarantor and preserver of culture. This, in my experience, could not be farther from the case. I have cited a few examples of what I consider fairly serious programming at CFAC. I could cite many more. Equally, of course, we have many light programmes of a popular nature, some of which we get from the networks of the CBC. We cover the sporting world -- and, I think, quite properly so. As many other stations have, we have a Farm Director who travels the length and breadth of the province -- indeed, at times, of

Canada, keeping our agricultural listeners up to the minute. We buy programmes from whatever source a quality product is available. In this we are no different from other independent stations in Canada, nor, indeed, different in any great way from the CBC. We feel a tremendous responsibility to our audience. They have to come first with us, for without them, we cannot exist. We, at CFAC are a part of the life of southern Alberta. Our drama director is an alderman of the City of Calgary, and also a member of the Canadian Cancer Society. Our production manager has been general manager of the Alberta Music Festival, and continues to be a driving force on the executive of this organization. Every service club in Calgary, save one, includes one of our staff members in its roster of membership. Our men canvass for the Community Chest. According to the records which we keep for submission each year in our Proof of Performance to the CBC Board of Governors, I note that no fewer than 220 different civic organizations came to CFAC for help in 1955, and each one received more than they asked for. Our chief engineer is on the advisory board of one of this continent's most important electronic manufacturers. Our sales manager has been public relations officer for the RCAF reserve squadron in Calgary. Our news editor is in constant demand as a speaker at public functions. Half a dozen of our staff

are active participants in the amateur theatre world of Calgary. In all this, I do not think we are appreciably different from almost any of Canada's independent stations. Nor do I think the culture of our nation has anything serious to fear from the men and women who are the private broadcasters of Canada.

"Of course we sell advertising. At CFAC we sell a lot. It's our only form of income, and without it we couldn't begin to do the job in our community which we do. And that brings me to another misconception. Some people, who obviously are not too well informed, feel that once a programme is sponsored some of its intrinsic value must be lost. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The programme, certainly on CFAC, is the same programme whether sponsored by us or by an advertiser. The only real difference is that once the programme is sponsored, its audience will likely increase, since there are now two parties interested in seeing that happen -- the station and the sponsor. At CFAC we maintain quite rigid control over our feature content. We would much prefer, for example, to sell an advertiser an announcement in a programme which we have created to appeal to a certain audience at a certain time than have the advertiser tell us the kind of programme he thinks he would like to buy.

"The best example of the critical control

we maintain over our feature content that comes to mind took place a few days ago. A Combines Investigation into the operations of certain Canadian bread companies was taking place in Western Canada. The first news item announcing this was broadcast by us in a newscast sponsored by one of the bread companies involved. No attempt was made by the sponsor concerned to ask us to play down the story, and it would never occur to our news staff to do other than use this, or any other newsworthy story, irrespective of who the sponsor might be.

"We feel we are doing a good, sound job of broadcasting in the public interest in our area. It could, of course, be better, and that is our one target. We will explore any idea that will, in our opinion and experience, improve our chances of bettering the existing service. Canada is a prime contributor to the Colombia plan nations. Would it be of interest to our farmer friends to know something of agricultural conditions in those nations? We think it might, and so we are exploring ways and means of having our farm director travel to those nations next year for just that purpose. What are our listeners not getting in the way of certain types of programming? We study that picture minutely, and as a result we have just recently scrapped an hour and a half each night, and re-programmed it completely to provide a service which we felt

wasn't there before.

"We are trying to do better broadcasting, but we do think our hands are tied to some extent by the present system of regulation. I have no intention of restating much of what has been said to you before more adequately than I can do now. But I would like to give you some instances where, I am sure, through no desire on the part of the CBC to be obstructive, our efforts have been hampered by regulation. From my point of view, this is particularly true in the matter of networks. As you know, no network may be set up without permission from the CBC. Sometimes the permission is forthcoming -- sometimes it isn't -- but certainly the trouble involved in going through the necessary motions to get permission has undoubtedly discouraged network efforts in the past. In Alberta we have a natural geographic set-up for a regional network, embracing Edmonton, Calgary and Lethbridge, with possible additions as required of Grande Prairie, Red Deer and Medicine Hat. Here is what can happen. During the last war the then Minister of Finance happened to be in Calgary on the eve of a Victory Loan drive. The local National War Finance Committee, with which I had the pleasure of working, wanted an evening speech by the minister broadcast from Calgary to an Alberta network. Permission for the network was sought, and was refused. I do not know what the reason for the refusal was, but I think it might have been because the CBC was

originating the Minister from Regina the next night to one of the CBC national networks. Whether that was the reason or not, the fact remained that what would have been good broadcasting in Alberta was not possible because we couldn't set up the network on our own authority.

"On another occasion, a good many years ago, we had a very peculiar situation regarding a network development. A certain advertising agency wanted to set up a network in the three prairie provinces for one of its clients. For reasons of its own, the advertising agency did not want to employ either of the CBC networks, as then constituted in the prairies. So the advertising agency sought permission to set up what is called a 'subsidiary' network, employing the stations the advertising agency wished to use. What happened after that was never clearly established from my point of view, but the fact remained that the subsidiary network never did materialize, and the business finally turned up on the CBC Dominion network stations. Let me make it clear that I have no criticism of the CBC for successfully selling their Dominion network stations to the advertising agency. I would simply observe that CFAC, and the other stations involved, had no chance to compete for this business since we could not present an alternative network setup.

"I cannot document either of these instances,

since they both occurred quite a few years ago, and I am not in the habit of saving routine correspondence for ten or twelve years on the off chance of needing it some time. However, this next illustration is of fairly recent vintage, and I append the correspondence for your information. In brief, the situation was this. The Prime Minister was in Calgary on the last day of Stampede Week. There was an election coming up -- this was 1953. In addition to appearing at the Stampede in the evening, the Prime Minister was going to address a noon meeting of the Liberal Association. CFAC laid plans to cover the Prime Minister's noon address. The Calgary Liberals wanted to know if we could originate the Prime Minister's speech to an Alberta network. We said we would try. Stations in Grande Prairie, Edmonton, Red Deer, Lethbridge and Medicine Hat agreed to carry the speech -- were not interested in charging money for the time -- after all, the Prime Minister is news, and especially so just before an election -- and we all were prepared to share the cost of the network lines. The case was put to the CBC, who would not let us do it unless we charged for it! We got the network finally, but we had to bill the Alberta Liberal Association for the time and lines on what seemed to us to be a very straightforward public service effort which we were prepared to do at no cost to anyone but ourselves. And it took

us from June 23rd until July 9th to get it all settled. Had we freedom to handle network matters ourselves, the whole thing could have been arranged in five minutes with a telephone call to one of the local line companies. The CBC throughout all this acted, I have no doubt, firmly within the framework of their own policy on political broadcasting, but what makes good sense to the CBC doesn't necessarily make good sense in every situation which can arise.

"This is the thing, I think, that rankles many an independent broadcaster. The CBC by virtue of its peculiar position in law, is the supreme arbiter on broadcasting in Canada. There seems to be no valid reason why this should be so. Other broadcasters in Canada should not have this status of second-class citizen. We are responsible persons who seek the right to operate our businesses within the general law of the land, and not within the narrow confines of an out-dated statute which places the power to tell us how we shall operate in the hands of a group of people perhaps no less responsible -- but certainly no more so -- than ourselves.

"Thank you for your consideration of this brief."

A matter of two weeks ago Calgary and Quebec City were twinned by our respective city councils and we have entered into negotiations in an attempt

to have them prepare a broadcast of their doings and problems which they will do in English for our use and we will have one about Calgary and put it into French for their use.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. de Grandpre, have you some questions?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Mr. Cairns, referring to your brief in the third paragraph on page 1 you say that the situation is fundamentally undemocratic?

MR. CAIRNS: I think so.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Can you tell us why you come to this conclusion?

MR. CAIRNS: Because we find a competitor in this area of competition, as has already been explained this morning, who has also the authority to regulate.

THE CHAIRMAN: On this I am afraid you are the victim of a question I wanted to ask for some time, and it is a question which has been put several times: now, according to this dictionary which I have here the word democracy means:

"Government by the people;

government in which the supreme power is retained by the people and exercised either directly or indirectly through a system of representation."

Now, this Broadcasting Act was passed by Parliament?

MR. CAIRNS: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: There were certain provisions which have not yet been changed by Parliament;

you may not like it, you may argue as vigorously as you like that it should be changed, but how can you say that the system so created is fundamentally undemocratic -- is it not fundamentally democratic?

MR. CAIRNS: You caught me in a very loose usage of the word and I apologize for that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I always admire a man who admits it. It is this loose meaning of the word which is bothering us.

MR. CAIRNS: As I say, I apologize for its usage.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You must have had something in mind when you used the word, the loose meaning of the word, you must have had something in mind?

MR. CAIRNS: Perhaps my meaning was that in examining other public bodies or other public corporations or other publicly owned businesses operating in competition with similar businesses we do find what in effect is a separate authority surveying the work of both. That seems to me to be also created by law and is a due democratic process, the Transport Board, the Transport Commissioners, and so on, public utility boards, and the feeling which I have expressed is that I feel the separate authority would be a proper thing in principle for us to have in radio and television.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And from your reference I take it you have in mind, for instance, the railways or the air lines or the telephone service, and things like that. Am I correct in reading into

your answer these particular parallels?

MR. CAIRNS: They are used as parallels to illustrate the point I am trying to make, the parallel may not be exact.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is exactly what I want to question you on a little further. As you are aware, the Canadian Broadcasting Act imposes on the CBC the obligation to provide a national service and they say, well, they decided it would be done partly through publicly owned stations and partly through privately owned stations.

MR. CAIRNS: I think that is a good thing, I think that is probably a system which, with some modifications, is right for Canada.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But, in doing so the national system must be provided through different outlets, must be provided through public outlets in given areas and through private outlets in other areas. How do you say that the CBC is regulating others when it is regulating the private stations through which it broadcasts in any given area in order to give the national system?

MR. CAIRNS: I perhaps did not follow you too clearly in that question.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Let us put it in very practical terms, let us say you have a railway ---

MR. CAIRNS: I have a what?

MR. de GRANDPRE: That there is a railway, instead of a broadcasting system, and that the railway is running on lines which are publicly owned for a

certain mileage and then privately owned for another part of the line, and the trains follow that line which at times is public and at times is private. If the railway company or the corporation regulates the section of line which is private, is it not regulating its own system in order to reach the general public?

MR. CAIRNS: I would think that would be a fair statement, yes, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Is it not the same situation in broadcasting?

MR. CAIRNS: Perhaps not quite. Mind you, and I do not wish to be misunderstood on this, I am not opposing anything save the principle; I believe that the CBC within the framework of the Act with which they have to deal has, as I have said, acted very fairly, I do not think there are many instances where they have imposed unfair regulations and they have been broadminded enough to change some as the years have gone by, obviously some form of regulation must exist, obviously, as is the case with Mr. Gaetz who preceded me and I think with other broadcasters, the principle of dealing with a body which is also a competitor is something different.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the point of Mr. de Grandpre's question is in his illustration of the railway -- can you operate that if you have to run over for orders and rules to a separate body every time, having regard to the regulations which are in their nature operational regulations, if you

are operating a national system?

MR. CAIRNS: Yes, I think in the framework if the separate authority were the regulating force that the distribution of programmes, which is a concern of the national system, would be arrived at in mutual and agreeable discussion as they have in the past. I do not know that the power to regulate in terms of distribution necessarily has to rest with the operating body, I do not see why they should have to.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, as long as they are set a task to provide a national system of broadcasting you could, because of the manner in which they operate, you could reach a point where they would not be able to provide it because the regulating body might not provide the regulations to permit them so that they would have to go into areas of the country where they are not now represented in order to give that national system. In other words, can you divorce responsibility from authority? They have the responsibility vested in them by that Act.

MR. CAIRNS: Yes, they have; I think they discharge it very admirably, too, in the main.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, with a separate regulatory body could they not run counter to what was envisioned in that Act?

MR. CAIRNS: I do not see how they can with proper safeguards set up in the formation of such a body.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: It is a possibility,

though?

MR. CAIRNS: I suppose so.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the real question arising from this is whether or not the proposal to have a separate regulatory body involves an abandoning of the principle of Section 8 of the Act, that there is to be carried on a national broadcasting service within Canada; that is the real question?

MR. CAIRNS: Yes, and I do not -- I may be a little obtuse, but I fail to see how they still could not carry everything with the separate authority of some sort.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, would not the separate regulatory body have to take account of the job of the CBC required to be done in giving a national service?

MR. CAIRNS: Yes, if it became necessary for them to provide additional outlets and the moneys were available to them from the public fund, I think there is nothing improper about that nor is there anything improper about negotiating for exchanging programmes as far as they have to work with the private stations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Under this national service?

MR. CAIRNS: Fine.

THE CHAIRMAN: But if that would be the purpose of the separate regulatory body, that would be staffed by a board of governors substantially selected as the Board of Governors of the CBC is selected and staffed by men similar to the ones who

are there now and whom you say are competent and responsible people. Where do you say there would be a difference except that you would have the extra cost of a separate regulatory body?

MR. CAIRNS: I say the difference would exist solely in principle, which is all I am speaking to, however rightly or wrongly. As the present Broadcasting Act is constituted the present CBC is liable to charge us with complaints because of the fact they are an operating body and a regulating body.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, so is the Board of Transport Commissioners; we got some of that yesterday. They are subject to a lot of complaints, too,

MR. CAIRNS: It seems to me that the CBC, operating a national system, could really and truly find itself in a more advantageous position in dealing with the problem of furnishing radio and television to this country if it did not have these regulations over its head.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are not doing this for the love of the CBC?

MR. CAIRNS: Oh, no, nor am I doing it because I think there will be any personal gain accruing to me from the stand I take. As I have said, many of the existing regulations are operations which we would adopt ourselves in the matter of radio broadcasting, some of them we do not like or agree with, but we could discuss that and we would prefer to discuss it with a board that does not also operate broadcasting stations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, do you then go along with what Mr. Gaetz said and what we have had in other centres where we have had private stations appearing, that this is mainly a matter of subjective fear on the part of the private broadcasters?

MR. CAIRNS: No, sir, I am not afraid of the CBC and I do not think I have any reason to be afraid of the CBC; I think they have treated me fairly. We have had our differences of opinion over the years. I say it is adhering to the basic principle that I would prefer my negotiations, when it comes to the matter of regulations, to be with a board that has no opportunity to compete with me for business or for audience.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: How would you suggest this separate body be composed? How would it be appointed, the number of men or type of men -- by profession or geographic areas or what would be their authority and powers? Have you any conception of that separate body?

MR. CAIRNS: Yes, sir, I have, but it is not sufficiently well formed to ad lib. If you wish me to do so I could submit for your consideration a document on that.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will be glad of any help you can give us. You see, it so often comes down to this: this is a problem which costs money, we are charged with trying to save public money if possible, and the most we seem to be able to get is a statement that you would operate better, or it

is a matter of principle, and it is very vague, and we want to get your opinions, your points of view, and we would be glad to have them.

MR. CAIRNS: I will do my best, and as I say, I am speaking of this matter purely as a matter of principle and I feel keenly about it.

THE CHAIRMAN: When you say it is a matter of principle you have to be able to state the principle. What is it that is to be gained, what is it that will be better for the change?

MR. CAIRNS: I realize that, and, as I said, probably not too well, the specific thing is the negotiation and dealing and discussion with a board that is not also my competitor.

THE CHAIRMAN: But, you see, Mr. Gaetz said it was done now largely by discussion and negotiation.

MR. CAIRNS: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you said a moment ago that this would be substantially the same as it is today?

MR. CAIRNS: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, is it fair that you should ask a fair-sized chunk of public money to be devoted to supplying this question of principle?

MR. CAIRNS: It may not be right, but I feel I have to do it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not want to press you on this but any help you can give us we want to get. We have to get at the fundamentals of this in connection with the separate regulatory board.

MR. CAIRNS: I will prepare and file with you later my considered opinion of how that board may be set up and how it should function.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Coming back to one of your questions, did I understand you correctly -- correct me if I am wrong -- that even if this independent body was to reach identical conclusions to the CBC decisions today, you would still prefer to have an independent body?

MR. CAIRNS: Yes, sir, I would.

MR. de GRANDPRE: What would be the practical difference then?

MR. CAIRNS: I obviously cannot make myself too clear, but even if they came to exactly the same conclusions that the CBC did, and even if they retained exactly the same broadcasting regulations that now exist, I still feel that to have a separate body that is not also operating broadcasting and television stations in competition with me and others is a desirable thing.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Well, it has been said to us that there is very little competition, if there is any, between the CBC and the private stations.

MR. CAIRNS: Well, there are the two forms of competition which exist to a greater or lesser degree, depending on the part of the country we are in; the first is for listeners and the second is for business. That does exist, but in whatever degree ---

MR. de GRANDPRE: You are in competition

with the movies, you are in competition with any other form of attraction or show?

MR. CAIRNS: Yes, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Whether they be on radio or elsewhere?

MR. CAIRNS: That is right, but the movies are not in a position -- and I do not say the CBC have ever done this but they are empowered to do it -- the movies have never told me how to run my broadcasting station and the CBC is in a position, they do not and I am sure they never will, but there is that danger which I do not think is proper in our society to have. I would like to see it separated.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, going back to your brief again, you say:

"So we believe, together with the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, that some separate authority, other than the CBC, should license and control radio and television in Canada."

Now, I take it that you do not exactly mean what the words say?

MR. CAIRNS: I am using it in the broadest sense; I realize that the CBC recommends.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That it is the licensing authority?

MR. CAIRNS: That the Department acts on the recommendation.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And the final decision

rests with the Minister?

MR. CAIRNS: The Department of Transport, that is right.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, a little further down you say that you feel the statute is antiquated in the light of present day conditions. Can you tell us what are the reasons which make you make that statement?

MR. CAIRNS: I cannot be too specific, no, but I do say, as Mr. Gaetz observed before me, the Radio Act is or has been in effect for some time.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I am sorry, but you are not talking about the Radio Act, you are talking about the Broadcasting Act, which are two different things.

MR. CAIRNS: Well now, here again I would be very happy to review either or both and place before you any comments as to why I think they are antiquated.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that would be helpful, too. There is no formal procedure and if there is any help we can get by supplementary memoranda we will be very pleased to have them.

MR. de GRANDPRE: This will probably cover all the questions I had set down for this third paragraph of your brief on page 1. Now, going back to ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Just one question while we have the witness here, Mr. de Grandpre. I was drawing with Mr. Gaetz the distinction between the different kinds of regulations, those that have to do with licences, frequencies, power and that kind

of thing on the one hand and what, on the other hand, I have been calling the operating regulation type, the business of putting out the service sort of thing, is it by any chance the inter-action of these two things that is causing your point on principle; is it that you worry about the operating type of regulation being done by CBC because CBC is also in the licensing or has some influence in the licensing sphere?

MR. CAIRNS: Well I never thought of it in that way; you may have a very good point there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do not let anyone take anything out of this except as a purely hypothetical thing. Supposing the licensing functions which are now with the Department of Transport were segregated, would you then have the same feeling of principle or would you recognize that, as Mr. Stewart said, for the operation you have to have a certain amount of authority?

MR. CAIRNS: It is a point that is worth a serious consideration and I would hesitate to give you a snap answer. I would think my concern would disappear.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if you have any further thoughts on it, do not take it as a proposal; it is really to get at the point you are raising because these words get to be loose and too broad, and you talk about regulation and you have to define what kind of regulation.

MR. CAIRNS: Thank you, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Could you tell us if your station is part of the Trans-Canada or Dominion network?

MR. CAIRNS: We are a supplementary station to the Trans-Canada network.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is, the station is added to the network when the sponsor wants to add it to the network?

MR. CAIRNS: That is right.

MR. de GRANDPRE: So your addition is at the discretion of the sponsor and not at the discretion of the CBC?

MR. CAIRNS: That is correct, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And you list a minimum operating schedule of eighteen hours a day. What would be your total operating hours during the week if you operate eighteen every day? That is easy, but I was just wondering if you operate eighteen hours a day on Sundays.

MR. CAIRNS: Yes, we do, the service extends a little on Saturday night.

MR. de GRANDPRE: So it is over 126 hours?

MR. CAIRNS: Yes, the way it multiplies out, yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And you list a list of the awards that you are proud of, and rightly so, and can you tell us what those awards were for and what kind of programmes they were?

MR. CAIRNS: Yes, sir. As I pointed out on page 3 of my brief, the programme "This Week" at 8.15 on Sunday evenings won two Ohio State awards.

The other one was for a programme called "The Week in Business", which we prepare for the consumption of Calgary businessmen. This is a one-hour feature we run on Sunday afternoons each week and it consists of a review of items of business interest and also a feature known as "Man and his Message", in which we go to the various service clubs and we tape record what appear to be the leading prospects to interest a business man, and from that collection of three or four speeches we pick the best to put on. The "Week in Business" show won the Beaver awards, one went to our chief engineer for some outstanding work he did in the engineering field during the war and the other one was for overall worthwhile public service programming, including programmes like "This Week", "Today in Business" and other shows. The Canadian Radio award was the first we won for an original Canadian play that our drama director produced. It was written by an Alberta author and done by Alberta Players, and it was first in this competition. The award from the Advertising Association of the West was for notable achievement in radio advertising; we provided what we had prepared and in competition with other provinces and the States we won an award. The award from Variety is an overall award, it is not major by any means, but it is nice to have. The Billboard Magazine award was for promotion of radio as a medium. The National Safety Council award was received by one of our men who also runs a programme for us in the morning,

and he did some outstanding safety work.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Most of these awards were given to you because of a programme which was part of a series of programmes; it was not an individual show?

MR. CAIRNS: That is correct, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, assuming that you are operating 126 hours a week, can you tell us how this time would be apportioned between news, music, farm broadcasts, public service programmes, etc.?

MR. CAIRNS: I do not think I have that analysis with me -- no, I have not got it with me.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose we can get it?

MR. CAIRNS: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, Mr. Cairns, I think you just mentioned this facet of the problem very casually in your brief. What are your thoughts on radio networks, private radio networks today, first of all, are they -- do you think commercial radio networks are going to stay or are they on the verge of disappearing?

MR. CAIRNS: That, of course, is really in the realm of a guess. I believe that more aggressively sold networks on a national basis for radio could remain. There is no sense, of course, in deceiving ourselves that television has not had a great influence on our habits, but there are many facets that radio can do that other forms cannot.

MR. de GRANDPRE: The reason I was asking this question was this, it was suggested to us while we were in Vancouver that national advertisers could

probably get more for their money by taking time on local stations because of the different time zones in Canada, and that if you advertise on a programme which originates in Montreal or in Toronto, then this programme will come to you early in the day here, and if the reverse is done then it will be too late in the East and there is this definite inconvenience to national network programmes.

MR. CAIRNS: That inconvenience certainly does exist, although a lot of it is carried out by delays. Often a programme from eight o'clock at Toronto can be released at eight o'clock in Vancouver, but in some instances permission cannot be secured for various reasons, but I do not think that radio networks as such should have their death knell sounding, I think there are still many homes that are not equipped with television, and not all the homes that are equipped with television are looking at it all the time, and more and more we are finding the radio set in other parts of the house, so that if, for instance, I am enjoying, we will say, the Adventures of Robin Hood on television, my wife can be enjoying something else on the radio, and the children can have the Lone Ranger in their bedrooms.

THE CHAIRMAN: Except, the children will probably be watching the Lone Ranger on television?

MR. CAIRNS: All right, then I will be in the bedroom.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you think there is room in Canada for two networks -- if the network

life span is not yet over, do you think there is room for an additional commercial network in Canada taking into account the population, wealth of the country, etc.?

MR. CAIRNS: Do I understand you to mean an additional network to the two now operated by the CBC?

MR. de GRANDPRE: A privately owned network?

MR. CAIRNS: In addition to the two?

MR. de GRANDPRE: I think that is right.

MR. CAIRNS: I think it could be done; I think you would have difficulty in getting it done so far as particular time, because I think people will have to assess the impact of television, but I believe it could be done, not, as Mr. Gaetz pointed out, on a sixteen-hour day operation at the outset. These operators would have to crawl before they could walk and walk before they could run, and it would have to be a few years, gradually expanding as resources permitted.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I would judge, then, because of the fact that you could not start except with only a few hours a day that you would probably run that added network at a loss for some time?

MR. CAIRNS: That is quite true if you could not have a contract with the larger companies.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand you could, but the rates are higher.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But it is conceivable it would operate at the start at a loss?

MR. CAIRNS: Depending to an extent on how its start was.

THE CHAIRMAN: On a slightly different point, not having to do with the impact of television or other radio networks, is there a change coming in the technique of this business of networks which Mr. Gaetz mentioned of using the tape and records of other kinds, how big a sample of the market you want to reach, a trend in this business which would attack the network from quite a different point of view than the television?

MR. CAIRNS: I do not think there is anything gainsay in that the network is still indispensable for certain types of broadcast, and it has certain disadvantages which are being overcome by the use of tape recordings. I think an obvious advantage is in the field of music, on a tape recording you can get better quality than land line, but on other things it is not as good.

THE CHAIRMAN: But, I mean, if you are attempting to meet the time zone problem you are talking about delaying it on a tape, which I know is done, and the question naturally arises as to why you should not put it on a tape to start with.

MR. CAIRNS: Well, there the value of the media is lost. This is perhaps out of my province, but the advent of this video tape recorded for television plays may have a very important future in television.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And the fact that you would have the two networks operating, two publicly owned and a privately owned operating side by side,

do you think it would have any affect on the character of the programming?

MR. CAIRNS: Allowing for the fact that we are in a very hypothetical field; you see, in actual practice what would happen is, a third network would have extraordinary difficulty in getting set up because the component stations do not exist in sufficient numbers. I dare say it could be done. What was your question again? Do I think the quality of the programming would be very different?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Yes, in view of the pressure of economics to try to keep it as economical as possible?

MR. CAIRNS: I do not think so. I think the operators of a network, just as operators of radio stations, are trying to provide the best programmes they can.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Provided they have the money to do so?

MR. CAIRNS: Providing they have the money to do so, yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, I understand that you will comment on the need of regulations and a different type of regulation that the Chairman has mentioned to you previously, so I will not ask you any questions on that. You have expounded at some length on the question of views, and it was suggested to us that the views of the broadcasters in Canada were slanted because of the CBC. I see that this is not the case as far as your station is

concerned?

MR. CAIRNS: Oh, no, I did not realize that had been suggested to you.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That the CBC providing news to several broadcasters, who, of course, had the opportunity of gathering news from other sources, this had a mild tendency, but a tendency to slant the news at times?

MR. CAIRNS: Well, that problem at the moment does not even arise at our station; we have not access to any CBC news.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Just a last question of general interest, which you have not touched at all in your brief, excepting to say that you endorse the CARTB brief, and that is a question of licensing of television stations. Have you any particular views on that?

MR. CAIRNS: I feel that where the channels exist it is important that Canada should use them if they can as soon as the applications are received, or, for that matter, Corporation applications and the channels are available, I think the licences should be granted.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Even in areas where there are already stations operating?

MR. CAIRNS: Yes, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And how do you contemplate these new stations, or how do you visualize them, affiliated to the CBC or completely independent?

MR. CAIRNS: I would think that would be a matter of approach between the CBC station and the private station. I would think they would go to the CBC and ask if they wanted them to distribute any programmes. It could be a matter of licensing that so much of CBC news be carried, but you go to the CBC and ask if you can be of service to them, and if they say yes, then I think it would not be difficult to come to a solution.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But you are thinking of an area not being serviced by CBC ---?

MR. CAIRNS: Well, such as Calgary, we have one television station which is owned by the three broadcasting stations, and I would think if another television licence was granted to Calgary, someone other than the CBC, and the CBC would like them to release its programmes, I can see nothing wrong with that.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That would not give much choice to the listeners if they want to receive the CBC programmes?

MR. CAIRNS: The point I am making is, the station in Calgary now cannot possibly release all the existing CBC programmes. I would suggest that they could release some of it, as they are now doing, and the other station would release the rest of it, and there would be a choice there.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you contemplate this as an immediate step or as a step which could take place once the country is more or less wholly

covered?

MR. CAIRNS: I would contemplate it as an immediate step.

MR. de GRANDPRE: As an immediate step?

MR. CAIRNS: Yes, I would say that if there were applications pending for television licences, where channels are available they should be considered.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Well, it has been suggested to us, and we hope to verify these figures, that in order to serve a private station with CBC produced programmes it costs the Corporation in the neighbourhood of \$100,000 a year for line recordings and other allied services. Now, if this is so, and if this sum comes out of public funds could you still feel that this alternate station should be given immediately, even at the expense of other areas in the country which could not receive as quick service as it would otherwise receive?

MR. CAIRNS: May I try to answer that in two parts? This figure of the cost to the CBC is new to me.

MR. de GRANDPRE: As I said, it is a figure we have to verify.

THE CHAIRMAN: Also I think it is fair to say it is the cost of adding a station mainly depending on the CBC for programmes, but to the extent that there will be some programmes there would be some public cost, whether it is \$100,000 or \$20,000 or \$40,000, it is a public cost.

MR. CAIRNS: I am not suggesting a new

television licence should be granted, knowing it is going to cost the Corporation \$100,000, because I do not think any television licensee who would go before the Board of Governors would even remotely consider such a proposition, they would say, "No, thank you, if you want us to sell it to you, but we do not want to be a burden to you." I am sure you would find people interested in that who would say they were interested in it but they would not want to be a charge on the CBC. Television is a problem of our nation, but in practically every phase you cannot have everything. The mere fact that in Toronto you have theatres and concerts, and we do not have them in Calgary, that is one of the advantages of a large metropolitan area.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes, but put it the other way: if by reason of opening up the channels in, say, Winnipeg and Calgary, it would retard the expansion of television into these sparsely populated parts of these three prairie provinces, what would your feeling be?

MR. CAIRNS: My feeling would be a little different there, but that is a big "if". If it was a question of another station in Winnipeg and the \$100,000 it was going to cost would bring programmes to Grande Prairie, then the \$100,000 should be spent to bring the programmes into Grande Prairie and let the private applicant handle his own programmes in Winnipeg.

THE CHAIRMAN: As Mr. de Grandpre says,

there is a lot of checking to be done on these figures, but it looks as if there is some cost that is involved.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Thank you, that is all.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just have one or two questions. At the bottom of page 5 you say:

"Our hands are tied to some extent by the present system of regulation."

And you go on to mention three examples?

MR. CAIRNS: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of which two of them have at least political overtones?

MR. CAIRNS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are those the only examples of your hands being tied over the years that you can recall?

MR. CAIRNS: I think so, sir. As I have tried to make abundantly clear, I have no quarrel with the CBC in the way they have administered.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is just a question of getting ---

MR. CAIRNS: Yes, we are hampered to some extent, we are hampered in Alberta by not being able to advertise on behalf of oil industries, and in Alberta that is an important industry and the companies are selling their stock issues through other forms of advertising, and I understand they have to post certain guarantee of stability before they can issue stock for sale.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are thinking of

advertising for stock sales?

MR. CAIRNS: It is one illustration that came to mind.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is nothing to prevent an oil company advertising its products?

MR. CAIRNS: Oh, no.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wanted that to be straight on the record.

MR. CAIRNS: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: There was one other thing I was struck by here; at the top of page 4 where you say:

"This fact is that no one broad-

casting system is all good or all bad ---"

I wanted to ask you this, as a private station operator do you feel that the publicly supported system of broadcasting or a publicly supported system of broadcasting, taking into account the kind of country we have and its geography and its sparsely settled population, is it desirable, even a necessary thing?

MR. CAIRNS: I very definitely do, not to the exclusion of others, but I do feel a national system is necessary.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, this notion of a basic national service is, in your opinion, a good thing?

MR. CAIRNS: I think it is sound.

THE CHAIRMAN: And would it be fair to summarize your view that you really are thinking of the private stations and the CBC or whatever it is

called as doing this overall broadcasting job together in Canada?

MR. CAIRNS: I think they have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Cairns, and I want to say I think this has been a very interesting morning, and a very helpful one. We will now adjourn the hearings in Edmonton. We open in Saskatoon tomorrow morning. Mr. Pelletier, will you see that our thanks are given to the municipal authorities for their kindness in making these quarters available to us.

I want to thank those who have presented briefs and also members of the public for their interest.

---The Commission adjourned at 12.30 p.m. until 10.00 a.m., in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

- - - - -

I N D E X

May 23, 1956

SUBMISSIONS BY:

Page

STATION CJCA

2075

Mr. Gerry Gaetz

Mr. R.W. Barnes

CFAC CALGARY

2138

Mr. A.M. Cairns

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

No.

Description

Page

88 Brief of Station CJCA Edmonton

2075

88-A Results of survey by Radio
Station CJCA Edmonton

2099

88-B Letters from listeners to Radio
Station CJCA.

2103

89 Brief submitted by CFAC Calgary

2138

ROYAL COMMISSION
ON
BROADCASTING

HEARINGS

HELD AT

SASKATOON, SASK.

MAY 24, 1956

J. 14

ROYAL COMMISSION ON BROADCASTING

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.
May 24th, 1956.

PRESENT:

THE CHAIRMAN	ROBERT M. FOWLER
COMMISSIONER	EDMOND TURCOTTE
COMMISSIONER	JAMES STEWART

- - - - -

COMMISSION COUNSEL	JAMES M. COYNE A. J. de GRANDPRE
--------------------	-------------------------------------

- - - - -

SECRETARY	PAUL PELLETIER
-----------	----------------

- - - - -

SUBMISSIONS BY:

RADIO-PRAIRIES NORD LIMITEE
M. Charles Papen
M. Theodore Prefontaine

SASKATCHEWAN FARMS UNION
Mr. J.F.C. Wright
Mrs. L.M. Lund
Mrs. J.F.C. Wright

SASKATCHEWAN WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE
UNION
Mrs. A.E. Peacock
Mrs. Aden Bowman

THE SALVATION ARMY
Mr. Edward Dyck

STATION CFQC
Mr. A.A. Murphy
Mr. Vern Dallin
Mr. Blair Nelson

SUBMISSIONS (cont'd):

THE ASSOCIATED CANADIAN TRAVELLERS
Mr. Angus Mulligan

SASKATOON COMMUNITY CHEST AND COUNCIL INC.
Mr. George Porteous

- - - - -

Hearings of the Royal Commission on
Broadcasting held at Saskatoon, Sask.,
on Thursday, May 24th, 1956.

- - - - -

atton
24

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we will start the sittings here in Saskatoon, I would like to begin by saying how very proud we are that we are the first, I believe, of at least outside organizations to have the privilege of using this very beautiful room in this very attractive new building in Saskatoon. This is really one of the most comfortable rooms we have been in yet and we are appreciative of the action of the Mayor and Council of Saskatoon for allowing us to have it.

I should perhaps repeat what I have said at the opening of all the hearings to date about our procedure. We ask those who are presenting briefs to either read them or summarize them so that we have the general gist of what they are putting before us. After that we will have questions from both our counsel and from members of the Commission. In asking these questions there is only one purpose, which is to get at the facts and be clear in our minds as to what it is the various witnesses are suggesting, and therefore if we ask questions they must not be taken as indicating any conclusions or any points of view that have been taken by the Commission.

Our first brief is to be presented by the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union and I understand that Mr. Wright is here ---

MRS. LUND: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but Mr. Wright is not here. I have the brief and will go into it now if you wish.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is Mr. Wright planning

to come?

MRS. LUND: As far as I understand, he is, but his telephone is out of order and I wasn't able to contact him this morning.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you prefer for us to take someone else?

MRS. LUND: I think for a reasonable time, if you could; otherwise, I would proceed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if you would prefer it, we will go on with the second brief, which is Radio-Prairies-Nord Ltee.

(Page 2184 follows)

Saskatoon, 24 mai 1956.

RADIO-PRAIRIES NORD LIMITEE

M. Charles Papen, gérant.
M. Théodore Préfontaine,
membre du bureau de direction.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will begin by marking your brief as Exhibit No. 90, and we will be pleased to hear you present the brief in English or in French or both.

EXHIBIT No. 90: Brief submitted by
Radio-Prairies Nord Limitée.

MR. PAPEN: I thank you, Mr. President.
If you wish, I will present my brief in French.

THE CHAIRMAN : I will follow you if
you speak fairly slow.

M. PAPEN: Je veux profiter de cette occasion pour vous souhaiter la bienvenue à Saskatoon et il me fait grand plaisir de présenter ce mémoire de la part de la compagnie Radio-Prairie Limitée.

Le Cabinet du Premier Ministre du Canada, par son décret du 2 décembre 1955, a institué la Commission Fowler pour conduire et poursuivre une enquête sur la question de la télévision et de la radiodiffusion à travers tout le pays.

Cette enquête avait d'ailleurs été recommandée par la Commission Massey en 1951. La compagnie Radio-Prairies-Nord Limitée, reconnaissante des services et avantages obtenus en matière de radiodiffusion, et désireuse de collaborer pour sa part à cette enquête justifiée, soumet respectueuse-

L2

ment le présent mémoire.

Il est indiscutable et d'ailleurs prouvé en suffisance que le Canada est une nation dont la population a deux cultures et deux langues officiellement reconnues, soit: l'anglais et le français.

Quoi que les citoyens de langue française soient en minorité en comparaison avec l'ensemble de la population totale du pays, il n'en est pas moins un fait qu'ils ont droit à leur culture, leur religion, leur langue et leurs traditions dans n'importe quel coin du pays où ils peuvent se trouver. Dans le même ordre d'idées, les citoyens de langue anglaise ont et exercent leurs droits dans le Québec où ils sont, à leur tour en minorité.

Dès lors, il n'est pas surprenant que lorsque le gouvernement canadien s'avisa d'entreprendre la diffusion radiophonique à travers tout le pays, les Canadiens-français, surtout ceux de l'Ouest, réclamèrent leur part d'émissions en langue française.

Le groupe français des trois provinces des prairies semblait avoir beaucoup de difficultés à obtenir satisfaction; en Saskatchewan, par exemple, le poste de l'Etat à Watrous ne pouvait donner qu'un programme français d'une heure par jour.

Voyant que les multiples démarches de la part des représentants d'organisations nationales françaises auprès des Gouverneurs de Radio-Canada n'aboutissaient à rien, un organisme appelé Radio-Ouest-Française fut fondé afin d'étudier le

problème plus à fond et pour essayer de trouver une solution acceptable tant par la Société Radio-Canada que par la population française en cause. Radio-Ouest-Française présente également un mémoire à votre Commission d'enquête.

À la suite de sondages et d'enquêtes faits à travers les trois provinces des prairies, il fut reconnu que seule la solution serait la fondation de postes privés de radio française. Pour mettre un tel projet à exécution, il fallait des capitaux considérables. C'est alors que la population canadienne-française de l'Ouest prouva une fois de plus que son désir de voir se perpétuer la culture, la langue et les traditions françaises était sincère. Au prix de multiples sacrifices, les Canadiens-français ont spontanément et bénévolement souscrit et donné l'argent nécessaire à la construction et à la mise en marche des quatre postes privés de l'Ouest.

Le groupe français du Manitoba fut le premier à tenter l'expérience. En 1946, CFSB vint en ondes à St-Boniface. En Alberta, CHFA d'Edmonton débuta en 1949. En Saskatchewan, en raison du fait que la population française est principalement groupée aux deux extrémités de la province soit au nord et au sud, et sur la recommandation d'experts-techniciens, il fut jugé nécessaire de construire deux postes afin d'atteindre toute cette population.

Ce fut l'Association Catholique Franco-canadienne qui, soit dit en passant, vous a déjà

L4

présenté également un mémoire, prit l'initiative de mettre en oeuvre le projet de la fondation des deux postes de radio française en Saskatchewan.

C'est ainsi que naquirent, le 2 juin 1952, CFRG à Gravelbourg, et le 30 novembre de la même année, CFNS à Saskatoon.

Il a coûté, aux Canadiens-français de l'Ouest un million de dollars, à quelque chose près, pour que le français soit entendu sur les ondes, dans l'ouest du pays. Ceux de la Saskatchewan ont versé pour leur part un tiers de million, alors qu'en toute justice ils auraient dû avoir ce service sans qu'il leur en coûte, tout comme leurs frères des provinces maritimes qui jouissent gratuitement des services rendus par le poste de Moncton exploité par la Société Radio-Canada. Pourquoi ces deux poids et ces deux mesures?

Le poste CFNS de Saskatoon est exploité par la Compagnie Radio-Prairies-Nord Limitée. Cette compagnie, dûment constituée d'après la loi, est régie par treize directeurs-actionnaires. Ceux-ci sont élus par voie démocratique parmi les délégués représentant la population canadienne-française du nord de la province. La gestion du poste est confiée à un gérant.

CFNS est en ondes pendant 15 heures tous les jours de semaine et 11 heures tous les dimanches.

En semaine, environ sept heures par jour sont consacrées à des programmes locaux donnant aux

L5

auditeurs le meilleur service possible. Pendant le reste du temps, et pendant la majeure partie de la journée du dimanche, les programmes émis par le réseau français de Radio-Canada passent en ondes. Parmi les programmes locaux CFNS diffuse des nouvelles locales et celles qui sont obtenues par les services de la B.U.P., des commentaires intéressant les agriculteurs, un programme consacré aux dames, deux programmes religieux, un pour les malades, un pour les enfants et un pour les écoliers. L'horaire journalier est complété par les programmes du réseau national français. Ceux-ci sont d'une haute qualité à tous les points de vue, et nous les estimons à leur juste valeur. Ils sont également hautement appréciés par nos auditeurs en général.

Le degré culturel, la réalisation technique, la qualité et le choix des artistes, la compétence des annonceurs et enfin la variété des sujets de la plupart de ces programmes sont tels que non seulement ils sont d'un intérêt public inestimable, mais encore qu'ils ne pourraient être égalés par aucun organisme privé sans que les auditeurs soient contraints à entendre un élément commercial qui très souvent finit par les ennuyer. Nous sommes convaincus qu'un service tel que donné par le réseau de Radio-Canada ne peut être rendu que par un service de la radio d'Etat si la radiodiffusion au Canada veut garder son caractère culturel autonome. Nous désirons féliciter ici la Société Radio-Canada pour l'accomplissement d'une tâche difficile

L6

et complexe. Au nom de tous nos auditeurs, nous voulons lui exprimer notre reconnaissance.

Après avoir donné les fonds nécessaires pour la construction des postes privés, les Canadiens-français de l'Ouest s'attendent, à juste titre d'ailleurs, à ce que leur poste respectif puisse vivre et continuer à leur donner le service auquel ils ont droit.

Pour arriver à cette fin, CFNS, tout comme les autres postes, doit exploiter un marché commercial d'annonces et de publicité. Cependant, ce marché, en raison de ses limites, est relativement restreint. Le commanditaire, sachant que sa publicité sur les ondes de CFNS ne peut atteindre qu'une population pouvant comprendre le français, se limite à un pourcentage de son budget de publicité en proportion avec le rendement possible. En outre, le taux que nous demandons pour nos annonces, est réduit en proportion du nombre d'auditeurs que nous pouvons atteindre. Dès lors le revenu des ventes d'annonces est limité. Une autre restriction dans l'exploitation commerciale réside dans le fait que la majorité de la population française de notre région est rurale et de la catégorie des agriculteurs. Cela veut dire, qu'au point de vue économique, cette catégorie ne répond pas nécessairement aux mêmes besoins que la population urbaine. En conséquence, CFNS a subi une diminution dans la vente d'annonces surtout de celles qui visent particulièrement une clientèle de ville. Comme exemple, citons

des établissements de nettoyage à sec, des stations de service pour voitures automobiles, des restaurants donnant service à domicile, des théâtres et cinémas, des taxis de ville, etc. etc. D'autre part, l'avènement de la télévision a, en une certaine mesure, entravé la réception de la radio. Le commanditaire tient compte de ce fait et n'est disposé à acheter que les périodes de temps en dehors de la télédiffusion.

Tout ceci a pour résultat que le revenu de la vente d'annonces est insuffisant pour boucler un budget de dépenses strictement nécessaires. Nous avons réduit le nombre du personnel au minimum possible, et les dépenses variables sont surveillées avec le plus grand soin. Il y a cependant des dépenses constantes qui ne peuvent être diminuées, telles que : taxes, licences, consommation de pouvoir électrique, chauffage, assurances, droits d'auteurs, etc.

La Société Radio-Canada paie à CFNS un loyer forfaitaire mensuel en compensation des périodes de temps employées à la diffusion des programmes du réseau national français. Ce revenu constant est une aide considérable à l'exploitation financière du poste et est apprécié à sa juste valeur; nous sommes profondément reconnaissants aux Gouverneurs de la Société pour leur bienveillante considération. Cependant, malgré ce revenu complémentaire, nous ne pouvons qu'avec peine boucler notre budget d'opérations journalières. Il nous est tout à fait impos-

13

sible de créer une réserve équitable pour pourvoir à la dépréciation de l'équipement technique, des bâtiments et du mobilier.

Notons ici que le poste CFNS n'est pas un poste privé poursuivant un but lucratif. Aucun des actionnaires ni des donateurs peut s'attendre à toucher un dividende d'un profit éventuellement réalisé par la compagnie, car il est prévu par les statuts que dans ce cas, le profit serait employé à de l'amélioration pour le bien général du public.

Considérant : 1) Que la population canadienne à travers tout le pays a droit à être desservie par une radiodiffusion bilingue équitable en conformité avec les recommandations faites par la Commission Massey, et notamment dans l'article 71 de la page 346 de ce rapport,

2) Qu'un tel service peut être donné plus efficacement et plus judicieusement par la Société Radio-Canada.

3) Que la population canadienne de langue anglaise jouit d'un service radiophonique national sans qu'il lui en coûte un sou.

4) Que les Canadiens-français des prairies ont construit avec leur propre argent les postes privés de radio française.

Nous recommandons respectueusement :

1) Que l'Etat reconnaisse que les susdits postes privés de l'ouest sont le seul débouché du réseau français présentement en fonction et qu'en conséquence il prenne les mesures nécessaires pour

L9

que la Société Radio-Canada soit suffisamment pourvue de ressources afin de pouvoir assurer ce service à tous les points de vue.

2) Qu'avec l'avènement de la télévision, les autorités fédérales prévoient à accorder un service bilingue à travers tout le Canada sans mettre la minorité dans l'obligation de faire d'autres sacrifices financiers.

THE CHAIRMAN : Thank you, Mr. Papen.

Me deGRANDPRE: Monsieur Papen, je comprends que les fonds nécessaires pour fonder Radio-Prairies-Nord Limitée ont été perçus à la suite de la campagne dont nous avons entendu parler à Winnipeg ?

M. PAPEN: Oui, monsieur.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce exact aussi de dire que les directeurs sont élus par des actionnaires qui eux, sont des délégués de ceux qui ont versé quelque chose à la campagne de souscription?

M. PAPEN: Oui, monsieur.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que le système suivi à Saskatoon est semblable à celui qui est suivi à St-Boniface ou s'il est apparenté à celui d'Edmonton?

M. PAPEN: Je ne pourrais pas vous dire comment est celui de St-Boniface, mais je crois que les quatre postes ont eu le même système de souscription. Je crois que St-Boniface, Gravelbourg, Edmonton et Saskatoon ont été pas mal sur la même base.

L10

Me deGRANDPRE: Comment opérez-vous, ici, au point de vue des actionnaires et des directeurs?

M. PAPEN: Vous parlez simplement de l'élection des directeurs?

Me deGRANDPRE: Oui.

M. PAPEN: Ce qui arrive, c'est que d'après les statuts, le nord de la province est divisé en onze régions, et chaque région a un nombre de délégués correspondant avec le montant versé à la souscription. Cette souscription a été bénévole, chacun a donné selon ses moyens et selon sa fortune. Un district, par exemple, qui a donné \$10,000. a droit à quatre délégués à une assemblée plénière annuelle. Parmi ces délégués-là, on choisit treize directeurs par voie d'élection, et ces directeurs deviennent actionnaires de la compagnie, parce que les actions ne sont pas nominales; elles sont nominales jusqu'à un certain point mais elles sont endossées; de sorte que si un directeur termine sa fonction et est remplacé par un autre délégué, automatiquement l'action qu'il détenait est endossé en faveur de son remplaçant.

Me deGRANDPRE: Et le bureau de direction est élu par les treize actionnaires ?

M. PAPEN: Non, le bureau de direction... les treize directeurs sont élus à cette assemblée.

Me deGRANDPRE: Combien avez-vous d'actionnaires?

M. PAPEN: Seulement treize.

L11

Me deGRANDPRE: Seulement que treize, qui sont directeurs?

M. PAPEN: Oui.

M. TURCOTTE : Et ils détiennent les parts en fidéicommis, en Trusteeship?

M. PAPEN: Oui. Aucun donateur ne peut dire qu'il a un placement proprement dit. Il a fait un don et ça finit là. Personne ne retire de dividende et il n'y a personne qui puisse réclamer quoi que ce soit si une liquidation venait qu'à s'opérer.

Me deGRANDPRE: C'est pour cela que vous indiquez à la page six de votre mémoire, au deuxième paragraphe : "Aucun des actionnaires ni des donateurs peut s'attendre à toucher un dividende d'un profit éventuellement réalisé par la compagnie, car il est prévu par les statuts que dans ce cas, le profit serait employé à de l'amélioration pour le bien général du public".

M. PAPEN: En effet.

Me deGRANDPRE: Quand vous parlez de statuts, vous parlez des Lettres-Patentes qui vous ont été accordées par le gouvernement de la province de Saskatchewan?

M. PAPEN: En effet, oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, cette campagne qui avait été lancée, a été le résultat ou la conséquence de cet effort qui n'avait pas été couronné de succès pour obtenir du français?

M. PAPEN: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous aviez approché le

L12

poste de Watrous et vous aviez une heure de français par jour ?

M. PAPEN : Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous aviez essayé d'obtenir de la radiodiffusion française des postes privés de la région ?

M. PAPEN: A ce moment-là il n'y en avait pas. Vous voulez dire des autres postes privés?

Me deGRANDPRE: Oui.

M. PAPEN: Non.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous ne les aviez pas approchés?

M. PAPEN: Non.

M. TURCOTTE : Pourquoi?

M. PAPEN: Je ne pourrais pas vous dire. Je ne sais pas si M. Préfontaine pourrait le dire. C'était pendant le temps de la guerre; je n'étais pas au pays à ce moment-là.

M. PREFONTAINE : Les postes privés, à ce moment-là, n'étaient pas si nombreux; alors, ils étaient surchargés. Etant des postes à profit, il n'était pas nécessaire pour eux d'accepter de vendre du temps à une association culturelle telle que l'Association Canadienne-française ou d'autres associations dans la province.

Me deGRANDPRE: Au simple point de vue commercial? Je comprends que vous êtes 52,000 dans la province, actuellement?

M. PREFONTAINE: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Au simple point de vue

L13

commercial, au simple point de vue d'affaires, est-ce qu'il n'y aurait pas eu avantage pour les postes privés de langue anglaise de vous donner, par exemple, une heure ou une heure et demie de français par jour, pour annoncer des produits particuliers qui se vendraient parmi la population parlant le français?

M. PREFONTAINE: Je crois que c'était une question de temps. Je sais que cette chose-là arrive souvent, que quelqu'un demande du temps aux postes privés; c'est la question d'avoir du temps. Il est probable qu'il y aurait eu moyen d'en avoir à une ou deux heures du matin, mais les Canadiens-français ne sont pas debout à cette heure-là.

Me deGRANDPRE: La licence que vous avez obtenue pour votre poste, est-ce une licence restrictive comme celle d'Edmonton ne vous donnant le droit que de radiodiffuser le français, ou si vous avez le privilège d'avoir des émissions en anglais?

M. PREFONTAINE: Non, seulement en français. La licence est très spécifique à ce point de vue.

Me deGRANDPRE: C'est une licence commerciale ordinaire?

M. PREFONTAINE: C'est-à-dire que les programmes sont sujets au contrôle ordinaire de la Radio_diffusion. Depuis que la licence a été accordée nous sommes affiliés avec le réseau national et, de ce fait, nous avons des programmes qui sont obligatoires et que nous devons passer, des

programmes du réseau.

Me deGRANDPRE: Comme tous les postes de base?

M. PREFONTAINE: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous avez un minimum de 16 à 17 heures par semaine, et après cela vous avez un nombre supplémentaire d'heures dont vous pouvez tirer profit?

M. PREFONTAINE: Justement. Pourrais-je ajouter à ce sujet que s'il nous était permis de radiodiffuser en anglais aussi bien qu'en français, il n'y aurait aucun problème financier mais ça empièterait sur les postes privés de langue anglaise.

Me deGRANDPRE: Prenant pour acquis que votre licence soit amendée et qu'on vous donne la permission d'avoir des émissions de langue française et des émissions de langue anglaise, est-ce qu'il serait préférable, au point de vue psychologique et au point de vue attirance pour le public, d'avoir des émissions qui soient mixtes, c'est-à-dire tantôt en français et tantôt en anglais?

M. PREFONTAINE: Je le crois.

Me deGRANDPRE: C'est possible?

M. PREFONTAINE: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, je comprends, d'après les chiffres que vous me donnez, que vous irradiez 101 heures par semaine. Est-ce exact?

M. PREFONTAINE: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Et de ces 101 heures

115

seulement 49 sont d'origine locale et 52 dont du réseau français de Radio-Canada?

M. PREFONTAINE: Oui, c'est à peu près exact. J'ai ici un schéma ou du moins une copie du rapport que nous avons soumis à Radio-Canada. Chaque année nous devons envoyer un rapport d'un programme d'une semaine, d'un horaire d'une semaine, et cette année ils nous avaient particulièrement demandé la semaine du 15 au 21 janvier. Cette semaine est un peu différente des autres parce qu'au cours de l'hiver nous avons diffusé des joutes de hockey à Saskatoon et, de ce fait, les émissions pour les joutes de hockey duraient un peu plus longtemps que les jours ordinaires, parce que nous finissons ordinairement à dix heures et que parfois le hockey dure jusqu'à dix heures et demie ou onze heures moins quart.

La semaine que j'ai ici, c'est 103 heures 50, et nous avons 50 heures 24 minutes du réseau et 52 heures 55 minutes de local.

Me deGRANDPRE: Mais, pour une semaine normale, les chiffres que je viens de mentionner sont à peu près exacts?

M. PREFONTAINE: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Je vois que vous nous indiquez, à la page 6 de votre mémoire, que vous recevez un loyer fortaitaire mensuel en compensation des périodes de temps employées à la diffusion des programmes du réseau national français ?

M. PREFONTAINE: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que ce loyer forfaitaire est identique dans le cas des programmes commandités?

M. PAPEN: Oui. Dans ce loyer que nous touchons, nous sommes obligés de passer tous les programmes commandités, sans autre rémunération. En d'autres termes, ce que nous touchons de Radio-Canada comprend tous les programmes commandités et comprend les programmes qui sont obligatoires et ceux que nous voulons prendre pour compléter notre horaire journalier.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que ce loyer mensuel forfaitaire est sur une base de temps, à tant de l'heure, ou si c'est un montant global à la fin du mois, que vous ayez pris, disons, 50 heures dans une semaine et 45 heures une autre semaine?

M. PAPEN: C'est plutôt sur une base globale, mensuelle.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous recevez une allocation mensuelle, sans tenir compte du montant exact des heures dont vous vous êtes servi du réseau?

M. PAPEN: Oui, sur le nombre d'heures que nous diffusons de leurs programmes.

Me deGRANDPRE: Mais ce n'est pas cela qui forme la base de la rémunération mensuelle?

M. PAPEN: Je crois que c'est un peu là-dessus qu'ils se sont basés pour déterminer le montant.

117

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant que ce barème-là a été pris, il reste constant ?

M. PAPEN: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Dans les autres localités où il y a des postes français, on nous a indiqué que les émissions étaient écoutées par une proportion et parfois une assez grande proportion d'auditeurs de langue anglaise ou autre ?

M. PAPEN: Oui, c'est exact.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous avez la même expérience, ici ?

M. PAPEN: Oui. Il y a nombre de gens de langue anglaise qui m'ont signalé qu'ils écoutent avec plaisir les émissions et surtout les programmes musicaux de CFNS.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous avez des chiffres assez précis sur la proportion des auditeurs de langue anglaise à certaines périodes ?

M. PAPEN: Nous n'avons jamais fait un recensement exact.

Me deGRANDPRE: Les programmes qui sont particulièrement écoutés par les auditeurs de langue anglaise sont-ils les programmes que vous avez réalisés et conçus pour être écoutés par des gens d'une autre langue ou si ce sont des programmes conçus pour des gens de langue française ?

M. PAPEN: Nous ne faisons aucun effort précis pour attirer un auditoire autre que les Canadiens-français.

1113

M. PREFONTAINE : Pourrais-je ajouter que le seul fait que nous sommes un poste culturel nous soignons nos programmes musicaux et nous les suivons un peu plus de près. Je crois que c'est cela qui nous attire autant d'auditeurs de langue anglaise qui sont développés au point de vue musical.

Pendant le temps que j'ai été gérant, pendant deux ans, par le nombre de lettre que nous recevions des auditeurs de langue anglaise de Saskatoon, j'en étais presque arrivé à la conclusion, un moment donné, que nous avions, à certains programmes, au moins 50 pour cent d'auditeurs de langue anglaise qui écoutaient nos programmes.

Me deGRANDPRE : 50 pour cent des auditeurs possibles?

M. PREFONTAINE : Oui, des auditeurs possibles. Saskatoon est une ville culturelle. Nous avons l'Université. Je crois que nous jouissons d'une culture plus avancée, au point de vue musical, que les autres villes de l'Ouest.

Quand j'étais gérant, j'étais aussi à la vente; et chaque fois que j'allais en ville et dans les magasins et dans le bureau de poste j'entendais des gens de langue anglaise qui ne comprenaient pas le français, dire des choses très édifiantes au sujet de nos programmes.

Me deGRANDPRE : Et cela sans faire aucun effort particulier pour attirer des auditeurs d'une autre langue?

L19

M. PREFONTAINE: Oui; sans aucune question, on nous disait cela.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que ce sont les programmes de Radio-Canada en particulier qui attirent ces gens?

M. PREFONTAINE: Au début des opérations nous n'avions pas autant de programmes du réseau. Ici, dans l'Ouest, nous sommes portés à être un peu Cow-Boy, et le folklore de l'Ouest est devenu presque Cow-Boy. Alors, nous, des postes français, nous essayons autant que possible de changer ces idées-là. Au début des opérations, les directeurs avaient émis une directive qu'aucun chant de Cow Boy devait passer sur les ondes; mais vu que nos gens étaient gâtés par la musique qu'ils avaient entendue dans le passé mais, comme dit Smith : "The novel force of Capitalism is greed", je crois que nous avons succombé et nous avons donné quelques programmes de Cow Boy aussi. Si la qualité de nos programmes n'est pas ce qu'elle était au début, vous pourrez certainement blâmer notre égoïsme en voulant faire un peu d'argent.

Me deGRANDPRE: J'en arrive à cette question d'argent. Quelle est la proportion de vos émissions qui soient des émissions commanditées?

M. PAPEN: Je dirais à peu près vingt-cinq pour cent.

Me deGRANDPRE: 25 pour cent sont des émissions commanditées et 75 pour cent sont des

L20

émissions de soutien soit localement soit en raison du réseau?

M. PAPEN: Oui, à peu près.

Me deGRANDPRE: Quelle est la proportion de vos revenus qui vous viennent de Radio-Canada comme loyer forfaitaire, et quelle est la proportion que vous recevez comme ventes de vos émissions locales ?

M. PAPEN: Si vous permettez, au sujet de la semaine en question ici, nous avons 52 heures 55 minutes de programmes locaux et 50 heures du réseau. D'après les bilans que nous avons eu jusqu'à date, depuis le commencement du poste, je vais prendre celui de l'année en exemple: Une heure de diffusion nous coûte, au point de vue frais d'opération, à peu près \$9.47, sans prendre en considération aucune dépréciation pour l'équipement, le mobilier, la bâtisse, etc. Si on considère que dans l'esprit de notre placement on devrait compter raisonnablement \$12,000. par année de dépréciation, il s'ajouterait encore \$2.28 de l'heure, ce qui reviendrait à dire qu'une heure nous coûterait \$11.75. Pour la semaine en cause, la semaine du 15 au 21 janvier, ça nous a rapporté \$540.87 en annonces commerciales et nous avons touché \$346.14 du réseau, ce qui faisait un total de \$887.01, soit \$8.61 de l'heure. Maintenant, je vais vous dire que c'est une semaine d'expérience qui n'est pas nécessairement moyenne. On a des semaines qui sont meilleures que ça.

L-21

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que je dois comprendre que même avec le loyer forfaitaire qui vous est payé par Radio-Canada, vous ne faites que boucler votre budget sans prévoir de dépréciation?

M. PAPEN: C'est en plein cela.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, on nous a indiqué, jusqu'à date, que les programmes que vous receviez du réseau étaient parfois d'un niveau trop élevé pour la masse des auditeurs et que vous préféreriez avoir une certaine sélection, soit à Winnipeg soit ailleurs, de façon à vous permettre d'avoir des programmes qui soient à la portée de la masse des auditeurs. Est-ce que vous avez constaté la même chose ici, à Saskatoon?

M. PAPEN: Pas directement à Saskatoon, mais dans la campagne, au début surtout. Maintenant, cette question n'est pas surprenante. Si vous permettez de donner un exemple tout à fait personnel: Je suis venu au Canada raisonnablement jeune et, après 18 ans de résidence dans l'Ouest, je suis retourné en Europe. Les premiers programmes français que j'ai vus, je ne comprenais pas un mot de ce qui se disait.

Je vous donne cet exemple pour dire que les Canadiens-français de l'Ouest parlent naturellement le français, mais ils n'ont pas eu cette culture ni la diction française européenne que les annonceurs tâchent de perfectionner ici, au Canada. Au fond c'est du bon français; et quand ils ont commencé avec les émissions du réseau national il

1.22

y avait certains programmes, tels que Radio-Collège, par exemple, qui donnaient des sujets qui étaient au-dessus de la compréhension moyenne des gens de L'Ouest

Mais je peux dire que depuis, après tout ça fait déjà quatre ans à la fin de l'année que le poste est en ondes, les gens se sont habitués, ils ont beaucoup amélioré leurs connaissances au point de vue culturel et ils se sont habitués à certaines expressions françaises qui n'étaient pas tout à fait dans leur vocabulaire usuel.

Ce que je veux dire, c'est pour démontrer par là que ce qui était trop élevé au début du poste devient un peu à la hauteur de leur compréhension actuelle. Et, deuxièmement, Radio-Canada fait un effort pour en quelque sorte donner leurs programmes au niveau de la compréhension des gens, malgré qu'ils soutiennent que les programmes de Radio-Canada sont fait pour tâcher d'augmenter la culture plutôt que de la diminuer ou de la laisser sur un niveau constant.

Me deGRANDPRE: Alors, il s'est produit un double phénomène: le niveau de la région s'est graduellement élevé et Radio-Canada a fait un effort pour abaisser un peu le niveau de ses programmes, et à l'heure actuelle on a rejoint la moyenne juste ou à peu près ?

M. PAPEN: Oui. Nous avons d'ailleurs eu une convention à Montréal, ce printemps, à la fin de mars, et cette chose a été discutée avec

L23

beaucoup d'attention.

Je dirais aussi que pour l'Ouest, nous sommes très heureux d'avoir un réalisateur du réseau français, à Winnipeg, dans la personne de M. Dussault, qui est un produit de l'Ouest et qui est très compréhensif aux besoins des postes de l'Ouest et qui nous donne une aide très efficace dans ce domaine.

M. TURCOTTE : Il est à Winnipeg?

M. PAPEN: Oui.

M. PREFONTAINE : Je voudrais signaler en passant le bon ouvrage que fait notre ami M. Finlay, de Winnipeg. C'est lui qui dirige la radio-ouest des deux langues, et j'aimerais à signaler ici à la Commission que toutes les fois que j'ai eu l'occasion de rencontrer M. Finlay et qu'il a eu la chance de nous aider il l'a fait. Nous tenons à le remercier cordialement pour tout ce qu'il a fait pour les postes français de l'Ouest.

Me deGRANDPRE: Je comprends que vous avez un problème financier qui n'est pas complètement résolu à l'heure actuelle. Quelle serait votre réaction si -- et c'est uniquement une supposition -- si un moment donné Radio-Canada décidait d'exproprier les postes français de l'Ouest pour en faire des postes de son réseau?

M. PREFONTAINE : La seule réponse que je puis donner c'est que les Canadiens-français ont donné leur argent pour avoir du français radio-diffusé. Que cette radiodiffusion vienne de CFNS

L24

ou du gouvernement, du moment qu'ils ont du français toute la journée, je ne crois pas qu'il y ait d'objection à n'importe quel arrangement, à condition que les programmes français qui soient radiodiffusés soient à peu près dans le même ordre et dans le même genre que ceux diffusés actuellement.

Me deGRANDPRE: Avec les sauvegardes que vous venez de mentionner, vous ne voyez pas d'objection particulière de la part de la population française de l'Ouest à une expropriation possible, et qui est une hypothèse que je formule?

M. PREFONTAINE: Non. D'ailleurs, cette éventualité a déjà été étudiée.

M. TURCOTTE : Par quel groupe?

M. PREFONTAINE: Par le groupe du nord. Je crois que cela a même été suggéré aux Gouverneurs de Radio-Canada.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, une dernière question qui a aussi été touchée par les mémoires français que nous avons reçus ailleurs, c'est cette question de la télévision. Vous réalisez sans doute qu'il en coûte beaucoup pour la radiodiffusion sonore et que c'est multiplié plusieurs fois quand on touche à la télévision. De façon à toucher toute les régions françaises de la province, vous auriez besoin de combien d'antennes de diffusion et 'boosters' ?

M. PAPEN: C'est une question technique qui est très difficile à répondre, mais je peux

vous dire que la grande majorité de nos localités françaises sont principalement autour de Prince-Albert, Saskatoon, mais particulièrement autour de Prince-Albert, et actuellement les gens de Prince-Albert et les environs jouissent d'une réception de la télévision diffusée de Saskatoon. A Prince-Albert même, dans la ville, il y en a qui sont branchés sur une antenne qui a été érigée au haut de la côte; mais dans la campagne au delà de Prince-Albert il y a une réception assez satisfaisante.

Je ne suis pas un technicien, je ne sais pas s'il y a moyen d'améliorer le rayonnement, mais je crois que la télédiffusion de Saskatoon touche 65 pour cent des localités canadiennes-françaises de notre province.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous avez fait des démarches auprès des postes de Saskatoon pour obtenir une heure ou deux heures ou quelque période de temps que ce soit de français ?

M. PAPEN: Non, nous n'avons pas encore approché personne officiellement.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce qu'il serait possible, au point de vue réaction du public tant de langue française que de langue anglaise, d'avoir une émission française intercallée entre les émissions de langue anglaise?

M. PAPEN: Ca dépendrait des postes; mais actuellement, depuis le début de CFNS, nous jouissons d'une coopération très amicale et très appréciée de la part des autres postes de la ville,

L26

et je dirais même des autres postes de la province, et je crois que si la question était abordée -- je ne peux pas prévoir l'avenir et dire avec certitude -- mais je suis sous l'impression qu'on nous entendrait avec une certaine faveur. Dans ce temps-là, il y aurait une question à discuter au point de vue des revenus et de ce que ça coûterait, etc; mais je ne crois pas que la question soit refusée d'emblée.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous prévoyez la possibilité d'établir un poste qui soit uniquement un poste français?

M. PAPEN: Non, du tout.

Me deGRANDPRE: Ce serait trop dispendieux et inabordable?

M. PAPEN: D'ailleurs, nous ne demandons pas l'impossible.

Me deGRANDPRE: C'est pour cela que je vous ai suggéré l'alternative qui me semble la seule possible, vu les circonstances actuelles.

M. PAPEN: Nous nous rendons compte que dans l'Ouest nous sommes en minorité, mais ce que nous demandons à la Commission, par le nombre que nous sommes, nous sommes Canadiens et nous nous attendons à être reconnus pour ce que nous sommes.

M. TURCOTTE : La population de langue française dans le nord, quelle est la proportion que vous atteignez par rapport au sud? La moitié?

M. PREFONTAINE: Je ne crois pas. Je crois que dans le nord nous sommes 29,000 à compa-

L27

rer avec 23,000 dans le sud.

M. TURCOTTE : Vous êtes plus nombreux dans le nord ?

M. PREFONTAINE : Oui.

M. TURCOTTE : Groupés autour de Saskatoon et Prince-Albert?

M. PREFONTAINE : Des groupes assez ruraux, mais principalement groupés autour de Prince-Albert. Il y a 92 localités dans le nord de la province où les canadiens-français résident et 43 de ces localités sont des localités où les Canadiens-français sont en majorité.

M. TURCOTTE : Est-ce que votre poste peut atteindre tout ce qu'il y a d'ici à Prince-Albert ?

M. PAPEN : Nous les rejoignons tous dans la journée. Le soir, la réception est plutôt faible dans certaines régions, particulièrement aux extrémités est et ouest de la province. A l'ouest il y a certains avantages : les Canadiens-français qui habitent là peuvent entendre Edmonton. A l'est, il y a seulement la région de Zenon Park qui est très canadienne-française. Dans cette région-là la réception est plutôt difficile le soir; mais dans le jour nous les atteignons tous. J'ai eu l'occasion de visiter un avocat qui est à Zenon Park, et sa dame nous disait qu'ils entendaient nos programmes toutes la journée.

M. TURCOTTE : Etes-vous reliés directement au réseau ou sous forme de transmission à

L28

retardement ?

M. PAPEN: Il y a certains programmes
qui sont retransmis de Winnipeg.

(Page 2211 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: I have just one question: Your third recommendation on page 6 of the brief reads:

"Que la population Canadienne de langue
"anglaise jouit d'un service radio-phonique
"national sans qu'il lui en coute un sou."

Is that quite correct?

MR. PAPEN: Well, actually what I should have said was, "un sou de plus".

THE CHAIRMAN: The fact is, of course, one way or another, whatever radio service we get costs money.

MR. PAPEN: That is true, but what I meant there is the fact that over and above what we pay as well as the other Canadian citizens in taxes we had to build our own station in order to get French. That is what I was driving at.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, in other parts of Canada private operators have built stations.

MR. PAPEN: Yes, that is true, but our station, while it is a private station in a sense, on the other hand it is a public service, in this respect, that the French people wanted to have French radio and they all donated their money, whereas in a private organization there is a limited group of shareholders who invest their money in a commercial establishment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, the motivations may be slightly different, but both groups are putting up private money in order to build a station.

MR. PAPEN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And it may be a larger group in your case, and in other cases it may be for purposes of profit, or it may be for purposes of other kinds of public service. Is it so unique as you seem to make out? That is all.

MR. PAPEN: In my opinion it is.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was only pointing out that there was something to be said on the other side.

MR. PREFONTAIN: I firmly believe that in private stations that were started outside of the French stations from the West, their primary motive was that they would make money out of it eventually, whereas with our station it was a foregone conclusion that anyone who devoted even \$1,000 would never get a cent back.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is a general statement, although we did have representation yesterday, or the day before, from the University of Alberta station which was an educational venture not based on profit.

MR. PAPEN: They have a station there, have they?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, all I am saying in a very gentle way is that this is perhaps a little too extreme.

MR. PAPEN: Or possibly not clear enough.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you both very much for a very helpful presentation. We have enjoyed having it and we will give it consideration.

SUBMISSION OF SASKATCHEWAN FARMERS
UNION.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. J.F.C. Wright.

Mrs. L.M. Lund.

Mrs. J.F.C. Wright.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wright, we will begin by marking your brief as Exhibit 91.

EXHIBIT NO. 91: Brief of Saskatchewan Farmers Union.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will be very glad to have you present this brief either by reading all or parts of it, or by summarizing it, as you see best.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, our President asked me to say that he would like to have been here, and so would some of the other officials, but they are all busy on the land at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that.

MR. WRIGHT: The Saskatchewan Farmers Union welcomes the opportunity to appear publicly before this Royal Commission enquiring into the complex and vital subject of radio and television in Canada.

We do not underestimate the importance of the work of the Commission and the effect that its findings and recommendations may have concerning the use of the most modern and powerful mediums of communication which -- minute after minute and hour after

hour -- enter the homes and impact the minds of almost every Canadian, including, of course, the very impressionable minds of children of practically all ages.

Later in this brief the Saskatchewan Farmers Union will make recommendations to the Royal Commission, which will include our views on finance and management of Canadian radio. If, in the first place, we failed to set down our opinions of the purpose, scope, and objective of Canadian radio and television, as we see it, we would then consider that we had not properly regarded our responsibility in the preparation and presentation of this brief.

Finance and management, as most every farm family knows, are important, but we do not view these undoubted essentials as ends in themselves. Finance and management are an essential combination for results which transcend finance and management.

Radio, with its faithful reproduction of the spoken word in prose, poetry and song, and all the many fascinating sounds of our world, is a marvelous thing. Yet more amazing and potent is television with its remarkable co-ordination of sound and pictures that move in such a way that -- to the impressionable mind, at least -- they are not moving pictures but reality itself.

The unprecedented and tremendous impact that these mediums have on the mental-emotional equipment of our children is both widely acknowledged and readily understandable. Many months before

the child has learned, somewhat laboriously, to read and to write, he has -- in the most impressionable and formative years of his life -- responded to the spoken word and has been stimulated by the actions of people and things around him. And now, due to that technological success which is television, he, or she, hears a variety of sounds and sees a multitude of realistic-appearing motion piped right into the home, and all this for the flick of a switch and the twisting of dials.

We have not discovered a boy or a girl who has seriously uttered something like the words attributed to Groucho Marx, "I find TV educational. When someone turns it on, I go away and read a book." And we do not expect to find such a boy or girl, especially up to the impressionable and vitally important age of seven, and we doubt that there are many teenagers affected by T.V. in the way Mr. Marx has said he is.

While in this brief we are not trying to say that radio and its giant progeny T.V. is designed primarily for children, we do say that for the fact of its impact and effect on children -- for that reason alone, if there were no other -- the control of these mediums must not be allowed to pass into, or become dominated by, commercial hands and minds.

Commerce is essentially concerned -- and understandably so -- with a sense of values usually measured in terms of dollars and cents. We go further and say that these vital mediums of

communication, with which this Royal Commission is concerned by the will of Parliament, must not be unduly influenced by what is good for commerce, because commerce, primarily concerned with monetary balance sheets, cannot be expected to act as either custodian or guide for either the heritage or the vision of the Canadian people, or long-term values of humanity.

A commercial attitude, concerning the usefulness of other people's children affected by the trade, is revealed in an article titled "How to Pitch for Children" appearing in Television Magazine for May 1955, and we quote:

"It is important to have the sales message
"delivered by a 'star' or 'hero' in whom
"the kids believe . . . We sell the kids.
"They usually get what they want if the
"product is okay. Mother won't make a
"scene in the supermarket."

A non-commercial association in the United States, the National Association for Better Radio and Television, has this to say:

"Today crime programs are being produced
"specifically for television in a volume
"approximately four times greater than
"in 1951. Murder, torture, sadism, morbid
"suspense are saturating children's
"minds."

Is the criterion of the "hero" or "star"
to be that which sells the most in a civilization

burdened with propaganda for an ever-increasing consumption of consumer goods?

On January 18, 1956 the Canadian Press reports the publisher of a national T.V. trade publication in his talk to a Regina service club, and we quote:

"While private stations may be somewhat short on producing cultural programs, they do have the business acumen to attract audience," Mr. Lewis said."

In reply to Mr. Lewis, editor and publisher of the Canadian Broadcaster and Telescreen, we could honestly say, "So do the manufacturers of comic books have the business acumen to attract audience."

In the Canadian Press report referred to, the publisher of the radio and television trade magazine which, we assume, is supported by commercial interests concerned, urged that the C.B.C. should concentrate on advancing Canadian culture through television and "leave the mechanics and gambles to men of business."

An obvious interpretation of the first part of that statement is that the C.B.C., which receives its authority from the Canadian Parliament, should confine itself to producing Canadian cultural programmes and allow commercial stations, if they so desire, to put the Canadian cultural programmes on the public air at a time when nearly all the youngsters and most of the adults would be asleep in bed or otherwise occupied, at a time when, in any event,

they wouldn't be watching T.V.

We consider, too, the quoted statement
". . . leave the mechanics and gambles (of radio and
TV) to men of business."

That kind of leaving is just what the Saskatchewan Farmers Union does not endorse. The control of these vital mediums of communication is too important to be left to anyone other than the people of Canada through their elected representatives in Parliament, and certainly should not be entrusted to mechanics of commerce and gamblers in business.

Further, in the Canadian Press report, we read:

"Addressing a service club, he (the publisher of Canadian Broadcaster and Television) advocated that private stations
"take over all TV channels 'making the
"necessary investments out of their private bank accounts and assuming all the
"risk.' If they failed, there would be
"no drain on the public purse."

That, too, is an interesting statement. The implication is that commercial stations consider the risk involved entirely a matter of dollars and cents risk. To our mind there is a greater risk, and that is the risk of reducing the public air in terms of T.V. channels to little more than a matter of what may be profitable to the trade. And, with regard to the ". . . drain on the public purse," the public is comparably "drained" every minute of

the day by the advertising mark-up on goods and services advertised over such communication mediums.

Every time you and I buy a product advertised on radio or television, you and I are paying for the programme associated with that advertising.

The publisher of Canadian Broadcaster and Telescreen referred to the "completely undemocratic" Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

We have observed that the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, spokesmen for those commercial stations that would have the Canadian people dismember their C.B.C., continues to infer that the C.B.C. is a tyrant and an agree responsible only and solely to itself. This impression, so freely given out by those who pride themselves on the furtherance of free enterprise, is, of course, not in accord with the facts.

The fact is that the C.B.C. receives its authority from the Canadian Parliament, and it is Parliament that makes the rules -- not the C.B.C.

As a people we should have, and the Saskatchewan Farmers Union believes we do have, some influence over our elected representatives to Parliament so that in this way we can have some say concerning principles and policies of radio and T.V. broadcasting as the present Canadian system is constituted.

For instance, we may refuse to vote for a certain political candidate or party, and we are privileged to campaign openly for the candidate or

party of our choice, and we may join with other citizens to organize a campaign against the candidate who, in our opinion, is unworthy of support.

We cannot, legally, organize a campaign against a commercial radio or T.V. station or advertiser whose programme we do not approve. Such organization is termed a boycott, and is forbidden under a section of the Criminal Code of Canada dealing with restraint of trade and related conspiracy.

We have had no information that the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, the organization of commercial radio and T.V., is pestering the Canadian public and petitioning the Canadian Government to revise the Criminal Code of Canada so that commercial radio programmes and advertising sponsors could be legally boycotted in a manner comparable to that which voters may legally "boycott" political aspirants to our Parliament.

The Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters representing commercial radio and television stations in Canada, in a brief to the Gordon Commission, refers to the "industry".

That term, the "industry", is not surprising. Hollywood movie manufacturers have long referred to themselves as "the industry". In the same brief, submitted under date of February 28, 1956, the CARTB which has become known as Cart-B, refers to Canadian broadcasting interests ". . . owned and operated by citizen interests -- then and now the case with all other forms of publication in Canada . . ."

A study of the Cart-B brief fails to reveal just how citizens, other than the actual shareholders and members of the Board of Directors, Cart-B stations, have citizen control over Cart-B stations.

To identify television channels with publications in Canada -- such as periodicals, magazines and newspapers -- is misleading, to say the least.

Any individual, or group of individuals, may launch a printed periodical provided they have the money to do so. They might publish in mimeograph form at very little cost of production, or if they had the money they might launch a national magazine or metropolitan newspaper. The point here is that they do not require or have to be allotted an air channel. Every radio and T.V. broadcasting station must be allotted a channel if it is to function, and channels are limited, not alone by Government, but by the facts of science and technology.

The Saskatchewan Farmers Union, for instance, publishes each month a periodical, "Union Farmer". Publication of this periodical requires no allotment of public air.

Printing presses are, relatively, unlimited compared to available radio and television channels. This, of course, is a fact. In the face of this fact, when spokesmen for private-owned broadcasting stations make such statements or attempt to leave such impressions in the minds of the people, these spokesmen are, in our opinion, underestimating the intelligence of the public. It may be that such underestimating

of the intelligence of the public results from a conditioning in "the industry" and is reflected at the same time in some of the programmes presented to the public. However this may be, it would seem evident that when the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, or any other comparable commercial proponent, seeks to identify, in the seeming interest of free expression and democracy, the procurement of radio and television outlets with the production of the printing press -- or mimeograph, or the typewriter -- they lay themselves open to accusation of deliberate attempt to misinform and mislead the Canadian people.

It would seem that some who profess to speak for the private industry have given an impression that private stations and the C.B.C. are engaged in continuous warfare. In our opinion, the publicly-owned and privately-owned enterprises are, for the most part, and for day-to-day practical purposes, co-operating members of the same system. The two are complementary. While C.B.C. has the responsibility for the production of national programmes, the private stations carry national programme service and receive revenue as a result.

A valuable service of private stations is local and regional news and programmes of local and regional interest. The Canadian system of public and private stations is unique in the world of radio and television. In our opinion, the partnership has arisen because of the need to meet the

challenges of Canada's immense geographical expanse, its relatively very small population and its two official languages. The co-operation within the Canadian system is indicated by members of the staffs of publicly-owned and privately-owned stations who consider themselves "in radio or T.V." and work quite closely together.

Radio and television are vital mediums for holding Canada's scattered and diverse population together. Saskatchewan farmers, like most other Canadians, want to remain Canadians -- not simply for the sake of the name Canadian, but because of a preference for a way of life which is Canadian. This way of life includes, for instance, our system of jurisprudence. In Canada our judges are appointed for life so that they are removed from political and other influences. We are not anxious to have our judges elected as they are in the United States. We prefer our Parliamentary system of Government to that of the United States which we find confusing and where elections seem to us to take on something of the atmosphere of the midway. We prefer a system of jurisprudence and Government whereby McCarthyism or anything similar is constitutionally impractical. The posse is not part of our history nor is the unbridled type of freedom of the individual, institution or business, which results not in freedom, but in anarchy.

While the profit motive undoubtedly entered into the building of the Canadian Pacific

Railway, the pioneer rail line thrust through hundreds of miles of unproductive territory would not have been possible without Prime Minister John A. Macdonald's National Policy which was accepted by the Canadian people. If it had been the wish of Canadians to view the costly and Government-subsidized line strictly from the standpoint of practical business and profit, without regard to Canadian expansion and unity from sea to sea, then a combination of business and geography would have decided against pushing a railway through a thousand unproductive miles of rock, bush, muskeg and lake, and we would simply have detoured south of the formidable Canadian Shield and thereby would eventually have lost our identity and become absorbed by the United States of America.

Almost a hundred years ago, the steam railway was a very modern form of communication. Since then, Canada, through Parliament, inaugurated Trans-Canada Airlines which operates not to the exclusion of privately-owned airlines.

Though by no means identical, there exists a relationship between railway and airlines and radio and television, in that they are methods of communication. In the field of communications that is radio and T.V., we are aware that if the profit motive were allowed to dominate, and if the controls now invested by Parliament in the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation were removed or seriously diminished, private stations would increasingly turn to the United States for profitable programmes and

the entire intent and whole purpose of Canadian radio for the Canadian way of life would rapidly be defeated.

In the opinion of the Saskatchewan Farmers Union, and we believe this opinion is shared by the great majority of Canadians of all racial and national backgrounds, Canada does not want to become culturally absorbed by our great neighbour to the south. In our view, an increasing number of Canadians are aware that cultural absorption would inevitably be followed by political absorption.

At this point, we express our confidence in the arduous and exacting work of the present Chairman of the C.B.C. Board of Governors who, we think, combines in remarkable degree, integrity, ability, dedication, and a patient capacity for seeing the viewpoints of the many individuals, groups, institutions and organizations which add up to the somewhat unique nation that is Canada.

As the National Film Board is making Canadian films for CBC-TV, we refer to the origin and function of this organization. Shortly after the National Film Board was formed in 1939, under the National Film Act, Canada became involved in a world war. Canada's participation in this conflict accelerated ". . . the making and distribution of national films designed to help Canadians in all parts of Canada to understand the ways of living and the problems of Canadians in other parts."

The National Film Board was designed to do,

and did do, what Hollywood movies and other commercial motion picture interests both in the United States and Canada could not do, or were not prepared to try to do.

When a previous Royal Commission was receiving briefs concerning films, radio and television -- that is, the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences -- most of the briefs so concerned had praise for the work of the National Film Board. We quote from a brief submitted to the Massey Commission of 1949-51:

"Working in fields so far unappealing to
"the commercial producer, the Board has
"opened new horizons for hundreds of thou-
"sands of Canadians with its films on how
"people work and play in various parts of
"the country. It has helped to preserve
"local and regional traditions . . ."

While Chambers of Commerce and Boards of Trade seemed to share, in wartime, some of the general approval and enthusiasm of the Canadian people for the work of NFB, at the end of World War II these organizations argued that in peacetime, National Film Board production is both unnecessary and undesirable. In other words, Canada has to have a dynamic feeling of national unity and purpose in time of large-scale war, but as soon as the war is over, those objectives should be allowed to fall apart and if they fail to disintegrate of their own accord, they should be deliberately destroyed. With this view, the

Saskatchewan Farmers Union, in common with other farm organizations throughout our country, does not agree.

However, it is a fact that the Canadian Government in 1946 pared down the budget for the National Film Board and, in our opinion, has since proceeded with a process of reducing a Canadian institution which has done some very exceptional work and which once possessed a greater potential.

What the Federal Government has done to the National Film Board, and, we suspect, mainly as a result of commercial pressures, is just what we do not want the Government to do to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, as we have been made well aware of comparable pressures with regard to this institution.

At this point the Saskatchewan Farmers Union makes plain that it does not hold a non-critical attitude toward the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. We have criticized, and doubtless will again criticize, C.B.C. programmes. Criticism is an essential of improvement. In this regard we are pleased that C.B.C. gives evidence of its own realization of the need for criticism when, for instance, air time is allotted to critics of its programmes, such as in C.B.C. "Critically Speaking".

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

1. The Saskatchewan Farmers Union believes that there should continue to be but one national system to provide both radio and television service to the people of Canada.

2. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation,

since it was inaugurated in 1936, has, in the opinion of the Saskatchewan Farmers Union, commendably discharged its responsibilities to develop a national radio, and more recently T.V., system to serve the Canadian people. This system is unique in the world of radio and television, in that a group of privately-owned stations -- especially suited to provide valuable service through programmes and news of local and regional interest -- operate within the national system. This complementary system has done much to meet the challenge of Canada's immense geographical expanse, its relatively very small population, and its two official languages. One system of radio and T.V. implies a single agency -- which is the C.B.C. -- and the Saskatchewan Farmers Union believes that the single agency should be retained to avoid television developing on an unplanned basis in its early stages, as happened in the radio field before the C.B.C. was set up.

3. The Saskatchewan Farmers Union is well aware of the fundamental difference which exists between the communication mediums of the press and that of radio and T.V. -- namely, outlets for the printed word are limited neither by Governmental nor technical restriction; while for T.V. and radio broadcasting, channels are limited not only by Government, but by science and technology. Thus television and radio broadcasting by their very natures become partial monopolies of the agencies to which the available wavelengths are assigned.

4. A national policy for Canada is

determined, as well, by the very large area and relatively small population of our country. This greatly increases the cost per listener of producing Canadian programmes, and the price advertisers will pay for the opportunity to advertise is severely limited by the sparse population of certain areas. In the field of television, in which costs of production and distribution are enormously increased compared with radio, the need for a national broadcasting policy for Canada's great area and sparse population is apparent.

5. The objectives of a national radio system set out by the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences are endorsed by the Saskatchewan Farmers Union. These objectives are:

- (a) An adequate coverage of the entire population;
- (b) Opportunities for Canadian talent and Canadian self-expression;
- (c) Successful resistance to the absorption of Canada into the general cultural pattern of the United States.

6. Under the national Canadian broadcasting system as it has developed, the formation of networks, and programming of them, have been almost exclusively the concern and responsibility of the C.B.C. Regional network programmes may not be carried without special permission from the C.B.C., and for the most part network affiliation with American stations is not allowed. The Saskatchewan

Farmers Union believes that it would not otherwise be possible to plan and carry on a national broadcasting service in the public interest.

7. As previously stated, the Saskatchewan Farmers Union recognizes that in the field of radio, and now in the field of television, private stations provide a definite and valuable community service. This service could not easily be provided by publicly-owned broadcasting stations alone. The existence of a large number of private radio stations has proven economically rewarding to their owners, and the same sort of development should also occur in television in the years to come.

8. To the suggestion that private and public enterprise in Canadian television and radio broadcasting should function separately and independently, under the over-all authority of a separate regulatory board, the Saskatchewan Farmers Union reiterates its belief that there should continue to be but one national system, responsible to Parliament, to provide both radio and T.V. service to the people of Canada. And since we have pointed out that the C.B.C. and the privately-owned radio and television stations are component and complementary parts of this single system, we conclude that a separate regulatory body would serve no useful function.

The Saskatchewan Farmers Union sees, therefore, no need for a change in the present law allowing for a separate regulatory body, since this implies that two systems exist. Should there be two separate

systems, each deserving of impartial treatment, the result would inevitably be that no truly national public broadcasting system could survive. It is unlikely, also, that a national commercial network could survive unless it was subsidized by the Federal Government. We cannot envisage special fields or classes of programmes especially suited to public stations on the one hand, or private stations on the other.

9. In television, the extremely high cost of producing in Canada a variety of programmes worthy of presentation, deserves special mention. This high cost makes it obvious, in the opinion of the Saskatchewan Farmers Union, that the concept of a single national, publicly-controlled system of broadcasting must be retained, so that utilization of commercial sources of advertising revenue can be combined in a wise and balanced way with the still heavy expenditure of public money that will be necessary to provide a truly Canadian broadcasting service.

10. With the advent of television, radio is no longer alone in the broadcasting field. This means it must change and adapt to the new circumstances, and make new and imaginative contributions to the educational and cultural life of our nation.

11. The Saskatchewan Farmers Union recognizes that the amounts of money provided by the Government of Canada to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for television broadcasting must be considerable, and believes that the provision should be sufficient

to enable the C.B.C. to achieve the objectives set out in paragraph 5. The basis upon which funds are provided, moreover, should be such that revenues may be known ahead of time with reasonable accuracy. While the operations of the C.B.C. Board of Governors is, at all times, subject to review by Parliament, it should be granted revenues not less than five years ahead, so that the Board can properly plan its operations.

12. The Saskatchewan Farmers Union, in addition to setting out the foregoing, wishes to put on record its appreciation of the extremely valuable special service to the rural population which the C.B.C. has provided. The imaginative service which has been given in the radio field, and begun in television, should be continued and expanded, insofar as is consistent with the interests of other sections of the public. We feel the following services are worthy of special mention and attention:

(a) Broadcasting of weather information services -- in particular the type of weather information needed by the farming industry in the various regions.

(b) Development of a very complete farm market information service for daily broadcasting in the various regions.

(c) Broadcasting of regular programmes of news and information valuable to agriculture and rural life, including interviews from time to time with agricultural

authorities.

(d) Development of rural listening group projects such as the National Farm Radio Forum.

13. Rural people appreciate the present system of broadcasting, which provides broadcasting service for those of them in isolated and sparsely settled sections of the country.

14. The Saskatchewan Farmers Union recommends that special and careful attention be given to fully exploiting the tremendous potential of television to contribute to the education of the people of Canada, particularly the people in isolated rural and northern areas where educational opportunities outside of broadcasting are extremely limited. It also asks that the television and radio school broadcasts be further developed.

15. In the opinion of the Saskatchewan Farmers Union programmes cannot be classified into "low brow", "high brow", or even "middle brow" programmes, because of the overlapping of tastes. What is desired is good programmes -- good music -- fiddlers, jazz, symphony or song. Similarly, comedy, drama, talks and other programmes. Whatever may have to be sacrificed due to financial limitations, let it be quantity (time on the air), rather than quality.

Respectfully submitted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Wright. I think you have had quite a spate of

reading there and we might adjourn for about ten minutes and then we will have some questions, if you don't mind.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

---A short recess.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne, are you taking this questioning?

MR. COYNE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Wright, in the early part of your brief you refer to the great impact which radio and particularly television has upon the younger members of our society, and you say:

"For that reason alone, if there were no

"other the control of these mediums must

"not be allowed to pass into, or become

"dominated by, commercial hands and minds."

In the United States, as you know, they operate radio and television on a commercial basis in the sense that the revenues which support the system are derived from commercial sources: Do you feel in the United States television has had or is likely to have a seriously adverse effect upon the children and youth of that country?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, it certainly could have in the same way that certain Hollywood movies have. For instance, the National Film Board made a motion picture called "The Pony". It was on television across Canada and it did very well in the United States as a revenue-producer. It was a very lovely picture

about a boy who wanted a pony and his father was a large grain farmer, and finally the boy gets the pony, and it was authentic; the boy took care of the horse; he fed it. We showed this picture at our Farmers Union family sort of gathering and it went over very well with all the children and adults. It is good artistry as well as being authentic. It was shot near Regina. Then we had the Hollywood Hopalong Cassidy come on next with all these fellows on horseback chasing round and shooting at each other and always on the gallop; they never feed the horses -- never give them a drink of water. It doesn't even show you how to put a saddle on. There is nothing to it; it is just a bunch of junk.

MR. COYNE: Do you really feel by virtue of the way in which the system is operated there that they have a serious national danger of the corruption of youth?

MR. WRIGHT: In this brief I was speaking for Canada. With regard to the situation in Canada, one of the reasons we do not want it taken over commercially here is that we do not wish to be dominated by the United States.

MR. COYNE: That is rather a different problem, because what I am concerned is that you are suggesting that if the control of these media were to pass into commercial hands and minds some serious adverse effect would result, and I am wondering whether you feel in the United States, where it has passed into commercial hands, they really have a serious

national danger as a result of that type of organization?

MR. WRIGHT: "A serious national danger": Well, I would say this, that if we do not make worthwhile pictures, and if we leave the thing to Hollywood and the Hopalong Cassidy business, that it is a threat; I would definitely say that.

MRS. LUND: Could I answer that. I think that the possibility is of doing the reverse -- that is, of helping the children and using it constructively. These possibilities are so great we must emphasize that. We cannot emphasize the danger we feel on the other side too much, but the opportunities for helping our children to become good citizens are something we must be responsible for ourselves.

MR. COYNE: The private stations whom we have heard from have pointed out that their most vital concern is their audience; in other words, they must build up and retain their audience and they can only do this by giving service to their audience, giving the people what they want to see and hear. Do you think it is a mistake to approach T.V. from the point of view that the people should be able to see what they want to see?

MR. WRIGHT: Certainly not.

MR. COYNE: If so, what other standard do you think there should be?

MR. WRIGHT: Very often they don't have the opportunity to see what they want to see. I think I have some idea, and probably you do, Mr. Coyne, of what

we want to see. I have worked in films and radio and I have some concept of pictures I would like to see, but some people, until they actually see the picture, they don't know whether they want to see it or not. They can't visualize it. Going back to this example of this film "The Pony", if you gave it to Hollywood it would not be authentic; it would lack the artistry it now has, and I feel it is possible, and it has been proven possible, to have films that have the popular appeal and at the same time are authentic and have some artistry.

MR. COYNE: But if they have popular appeal isn't it likely that they would be developed by commercial organizations whose success depends upon popular appeal?

MR. WRIGHT: It may be in some instances. For instance, we sent a delegation from Saskatchewan during our jubilee year to Hollywood, and they started a picture and called it "Saskatchewan". It was being shot around Banff, and the delegation tried to persuade Hollywood to take the picture in Saskatchewan or change the name, but Hollywood said, "That is a good name; it is a funny sounding name and that is what we want and that will sell the picture", with no regard for authenticity.

MR. COYNE: Would you agree it is not wise to be too dogmatic in this field?

MR. WRIGHT: I would agree with that, certainly. I think that would apply to anything. Don't you think you and I would agree on that, Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: I think we would. A little further on in your brief you quote from certain publications and press reports?

MR. WRIGHT: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Which reflect, you suggest, in some degree, in any event, the attitude of commercial interests in this field. When we were in Winnipeg we received a brief that was presented by Mr. Swailes on behalf of the Labour Organizations in Manitoba, the burden of which was quite similar to your own brief today, but in that brief he quoted with approbation a speech that had been made by one of the Executive Directors of the National Broadcasting System in the United States. Would you agree that the particular quotations that you have made do not necessarily represent the attitude of all the persons interested in commercial radio and television?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, I don't know about that. What I would like to see, Mr. Coyne, is when statements such as I have quoted here -- and I have the source of them -- when they are made I would like to see those private station owners who do not agree with such statements get up and say so right on television and radio, and then, besides that, take some pains to straighten out things so that it is their spokesman. With regard to these statements I have made here, all we hear is silence.

MR. COYNE: At the top of page 6 you say:
"We have observed that the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters,

"spokesmen for those commercial stations
"that would have the Canadian people dis-
"member their C.B.C., continues to infer
"that the C.B.C. is a tyrant and an ogre
"responsible only and solely to itself."

I would like to ask you what you mean by "dismember their C.B.C.", because as a matter of record the CARTB have not so far before this Commission made any suggestion to dismember in the sense of emasculating the C.B.C.; in fact, they have specifically denied any such intention. When you say you understand they want to dismember the C.B.C., could you be a little more specific?

MR. WRIGHT: We have in the brief where they wish to leave the C.B.C. to make the cultural programmes.

MR. COYNE: I don't think that is the position of the CARTB. That is Mr. Lewis' position.

MR. WRIGHT: Isn't it the Canadian Broadcast and Telescreen; doesn't it reflect the views?

MR. COYNE: I don't believe so.

MR. WRIGHT: It is not a house organization?

MR. COYNE: No.

MR. WRIGHT: Strictly on its own?

MR. COYNE: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, it would be very interesting if these private stations would refute some of these things.

MR. COYNE: I think I am right in saying that it is in no way related.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Allard is here, and perhaps he could help us.

MR. ALLARD: That is entirely correct. Mr. Lewis is a private publisher and his paper is not the housework of the CARTB.

MR. WRIGHT: May I ask who are the main subscribers to this publication?

MR. ALLARD: Its main subscribers are those people who, for one reason or another, are interested in the broadcasting or advertising business.

MR. WRIGHT: Then it is quite courageous of Mr. Lewis. That is the old editorial spirit that reminds me of John W. Defoe.

MR. COYNE: Well, as a publisher I suppose he is entitled to his point of view. Going on, on page 6, I want to ask a series of questions on your brief: In the next paragraph you say:

"The fact is that the C.B.C. receives its
"authority from the Canadian Parliament,
"and it is Parliament that makes the rules--
"not the C.B.C."

You are not suggesting there that it is Parliament which makes the broadcasting regulations?

MR. WRIGHT: The broadcasting regulations?

MR. COYNE: In other words, under the Act, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation makes the regulations, not Parliament.

MR. WRIGHT: Well yes, but you are not suggesting that the C.B.C. could exist on its own without the support of Parliament?

MR. COYNE: No, I am not, and I just wanted to clarify what you meant. I take it you mean Parlia-

ment passed the Broadcasting Act which constitutes the Corporation?

MR. WRIGHT: That is right, and can change the Act at its will.

MR. COYNE: But you are not suggesting Parliament specifically enacts the regulations which govern broadcasting?

MR. WRIGHT: No. I have covered the House of Commons as a reporter, and I could see that was not going on.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean, makes the rules in the broad sense of the word that they lay down the framework of the law?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, the policy.

MR. COYNE: One of the ideas that has been put forward to the Commission quite frequently, is the proposition that there is a danger in a democratic state that arises from having any Government body controlling or directing or even taking part in a medium of communication of information, that Government control of such things is not consistent with a democratic society: Would you care to comment on that general proposition, that there is a danger in Government activity in this field?

MR. WRIGHT: You are saying there is a danger?

MR. COYNE: No, I am saying it has been suggested to us.

MR. WRIGHT: Oh, yes.

MR. COYNE: That there is a danger.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. Well, of course, as we know, the days of laissez faire free enterprise are gone, pretty well. I mean that it developed in England a hundred years ago, probably reached its peak prior to World War I, and since World War I, and very largely because of it, from the historical sense, Government has stepped more and more into everything. I mean, our income tax really began in World War I, and it is pretty difficult to suggest that we go back to that form of free enterprise that we had prior to World War I and do away with all these Government services and interferences; I think it would be impossible. We could not have anything other than an anarchy.

MR. COYNE: Is your analogy apt in the case of media of communication, because I think you could say over the last three hundred years the development has been precisely the opposite; the Government's freedom of the press has developed -- the Government has gone away from that.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, and I thought I made clear in the brief -- and evidently I didn't -- the difference between the publishing -- periodicals, newspapers, magazines, and so forth -- that which comes off the mimeograph, the typewriter, the printing press -- and that which comes per the radio and television.

MR. COYNE: But you don't feel there is any danger of thought control, if you like, that arises out of the fact that the broadcasting field is dominated by a Crown corporation which is responsible to Parliament which is dominated by a political party

with which you or I or the other fellow may not agree?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, in my experience with radio, for instance, and where public matters are discussed, I find, along with others, that the Capital Report gives them a very free hand, and the opinions expressed by those who speak on Capital Report are of a higher calibre than the editorials in many newspapers.

MR. COYNE: You say in broadcasting this danger has not developed?

MR. WRIGHT: I would say that. I would say there is always a danger and we could always lose our democracy because it is so young, and most of the world hasn't got it.

THE CHAIRMAN: May we approach the point in a slightly different way? Assuming there is this danger which is fairly obvious and has been put to us many times, let us assume it exists, and assume also that Government for various reasons, some of which you have put in your brief, will necessarily in Canada have to be involved in radio and television; what are the best safeguards that can be erected against the danger?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, there is only one fundamental safeguard, and that is the individual himself. We would like to see every individual, even if it is an alert minority, the individual who through his groups and organizations maintains democracy. It is a matter of attitude and practice on the part of citizens.

THE CHAIRMAN: There may be certain

organizational arrangements which will increase the safeguards and others that will make them less present. Take one specific one: Do you think that having the C.B.C. -- whatever you call it -- as the organization responsible to Parliament, as it is now, is better than if it were responsible, say, to a Department of Government or a particular Minister; is there advantage in having it responsible to Parliament?

MR. WRIGHT: I think there is.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there anything that can be done through the Board of Governors' appointment type of thing to give it independence and protection in the way of a safeguard against interference?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, I think that will rest largely with the appointments. If you have to find these individuals with integrity and understanding and of sufficient calibre, if they were unduly interfered with, when things were pushed on, they would see that did not happen.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not talking about what has happened in the past, but merely talking of mechanics; is the Board of Governors one of the safeguards that may exist in this field?

MR. WRIGHT: I think it is, yes.

MR. COYNE: You then go on and speak of the difficulty of boycotting a private station and you suggest this means that it is difficult for public opinion to come to bear on it. Perhaps I am reading something into it, but I draw that inference.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, you and I can go out

and organize to refuse to support a political candidate. That is to say, he is out on the hustings selling his programme and we can refuse to have anything to do with him, and we can organize and have placards around. However, if you and I decided that we did not like a certain soap opera, and we go out to boycott that particular soap, that is illegal; it is contrary to the Criminal Code.

MR. COYNE: But in that case can't you turn off your radio?

MR. WRIGHT: There is a big difference between turning off your radio in your own private home and other people turning them off; and going out and exposing the situation.

MR. COYNE: But the private broadcasters by their very nature must maintain their audience; they must be very sensitive to public opinion; they must have listeners, and if you and I and enough people twist the dial, isn't that about the most effective sanction you could possibly have?

MR. WRIGHT: Wouldn't it be more effective, instead of turning off the radio or television, if you and I, who like to see the very best type of programmes we can get, could organize publicly for certain programmes and against others?

THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose it is a question of degree, Mr. Coyne -- a question of how bad it is before you turn it off.

MR. COYNE: That may be so. Turning now to your next point on page 7 where you are drawing

the distinction between publication and broadcasting, you say at about the middle of the page:

"Any individual, or group of individuals,
"may launch a printed periodical provided
"they have the money to do so."

MR. WRIGHT: That is right.

MR. COYNE: From a practical point of view, as distinct from a theoretical point of view, are not those words "provided they have the money to do so" the most important part of that sentence?

MR. WRIGHT: The money is necessary, of course, but also with the money is the will to do so, which I think is very important, and the ability to do so. We look after a publication for the Farmers Union, and it is not a commercial publication; it does not pay, but we have the will to publish it and we manage to get the money, and every once in a while when the money runs short we cut down the number of pages. We try to maintain the standard of editorial content.

MR. COYNE: Take the City of Saskatoon where there is only one daily newspaper, and I think there are three radio stations and one television station?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Is the fact that, as you say, anybody can start a printing press, whereas anybody who wants to start a radio station must have a license to use an air channel . . .

MR. WRIGHT: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Does that really have much bearing on the question of whether or not you are going to get variety in radio as distinct from the newspaper business? Isn't the importance of the financial consideration such that it simply is not possible to multiply daily newspapers in the sense in which you suggest?

MR. WRIGHT: You mean multiply them?

MR. COYNE: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: You mean to get another newspaper in here?

MR. COYNE: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: I imagine you would need about \$1 million for that, but suppose that the Star Phoenix became misleading in its editorials to the extent that public opinion became aroused to a sufficient extent; well then, you and I, Mr. Coyne, although we haven't much money, you and I could get a mimeograph going to get the public interest, and it may grow into something and we might get some backing, and the Star Phoenix would probably reverse its policy. You and I cannot do the same thing -- there is no such thing comparable -- a few sheets like this to a daily newspaper; we can't do that sort of thing in radio or television.

(Page 2248 follows)

MR COYNE: Except, I would suggest that it is very effective to turn off the dial radio set if you are getting something you do not want to get.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, that is another question.

MR? COYNE: Well, it has been suggested to us that whereas there is electronically a limitation on the number of channels available to radio stations and the number of television channels, as a practical economic condition there are more channels than will ever be used because of the economic factors which are involved, now if that is so does this theoretical argument based on the limited number of channels have much validity?

MR. WRIGHT: Did you say if it is so, or did you say it is so.

MR. COYNE: I say if it is so.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, I do not know all the facts.

MR. COYNE: No, but I am saying for the purpose of the question if it is so.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, we assume it is so and what do we do then?

MR. COYNE: I would like to know whether in those circumstances if there are in fact available radio and television channels that are not being used is there much validity in an argument, in a theoretical argument which draws the distinction between this and the radio based upon the limited number of channels.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, a great deal of validity.

MR. COYNE: Why.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, I will go over it again - I do not want to waste too much time but you are going back to the question I have already answered but I will start over again if that is what you want. There is no such thing as a radio or television outlet that could be on a small scale like you could have a mimeographed publication, there is no such thing; you have radio and television, you have to have the whole equipment but in the printed work there is such a thing. I cannot make it plainer than that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that the object is to bring out as many points as possible and what you are really doing is enlarging on your argument about the limited number of channels. You are saying, as I understand it, that there is no relationship between the number of channels and the number of printed publications since the number of the latter may be unlimited.

MR. WRIGHT: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne is pointing out that is a slightly different argument to the one in your brief.

MR. WRIGHT: I am very grateful to Mr. Coyne for bringing it up.

MR. COYNE: That is what I am here for.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I pointed out this morning but I do not think you were here, that we are conducting our investigation in order to elicit the facts, and by putting a critical eye on any argument put before us.....

and we can have^{only}/one witness at a time.

MR. COYNE: Then turning to page 8, the paragraph about two thirds of the way down the page:

"It would seem that some who profess to speak for the private industry have given the impression that private stations and the CBC are engaged in continuous warfare."

Then you go on to say that in fact they are co-operating members of the same system. The "some" who profess to speak and give this impression you do not mean the CARTB?

MR. WRIGHT: No, not officially, no.

MR. COYNE: Because I do not think that would be an accurate representation of their position?

MR. WRIGHT: No.

MR. COYNE: And then turning to page 10 at the bottom you say:

"In the opinion of the Saskatchewan Farmers Union, and we believe the opinion is shared by the great majority of Canadians of all racial and national backgrounds, Canada does not want to become culturally absorbed by our great neighbour to the south. In our view an increasing number of Canadians are aware that cultural absorbtion would inevitably be followed by political absorbtion.

Would you not feel that this opinion that you speak of is already shared by the private broadcasters?

MR. WRIGHT: I doubt it because suppose there was not CBC regulatory body as it is now and the whole thing thrown wide open and we dispensed with our present

set up, I think you would find that the private stations would buy on the cheapest market, the pictures that would have the appeal that you speak of, the Hopalong Cassidy type that you and I do not want to see too much of and they would buy them on the cheapest market and show them here.

MR. COYNE: You are speaking of opinion here, would it not be that economic circumstances would drive them to carry these programmes, is a matter of opinion?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, that would naturally develop, I think when you think of it in business terms, they are in business.

MR. COYNE: You are not suggesting that they do this because they feel we should be culturally absorbed?

MR. WRIGHT: No, I do not think they are the least bit concerned with culture, but they are concerned with dollars and cents .

MR. COYNE: Turning to your summary and recommendations, point 2 and also point 7, would it be fair to summarize the position of the Sastachewan Farmers Union as this, that you approve of the present system which has been developed in radio and in which the private broadcasters play their particular part and also that you recommend that a similar system develop in the case of television?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Is that a fair summary?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. And, if we -- they can improve the programmes - however, we are not looking upon

it is a static thing at all.

MR. COYNE: I was looking at it from the basis of organization, not content.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Then, under point 2 on page 13 you say:

"One system of radio and T.V. implies a single agency - which is the CBC---"

Would not this separate regulatory board which the CARTB recommended as a board to control and develop broadcasting in Canada, would it not be a single agency in the same sense?

MR. WRIGHT: Oh no, I do not think it would be because you divide your control then.

MR. COYNE: Well, the proposition seems to be that the control would be invested in this regulatory board and it would then regulate and control all the broadcasting agencies, both publicly owned and privately owned.

MR. WRIGHT: What would the advantage be to the CARTB people.

MR. COYNE: Well that is one of the things we asked them too, but you do not feel that a separate regulatory board could be a single agency in the sense in which you use the phrase on page 13?

MR. WRIGHT: That is right, we do not feel that.

MR. COYNE: Why do you say later of page 15 that if this system was adopted:

"The result would inevitably be that no truly national broadcasting system could survive."?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, well, you would not have co-ordination that you now have and as I say, the tendency would be to free, if you want to use that word the commercial stations more and more in the direction of where they could buy the cheapest market.

MR. COYNE: Supposing this regulatory board had precisely the same powers of regulation and control as the CBC board now has, why would this result you speak of develop?

MR. WRIGHT: Precisely the same powers?

MR. COYNE: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, if they had precisely the same powers --

MR. COYNE: That is in the regulation, they are not broadcasting but regulating.

MR. WRIGHT: And they had the same powers as the CBC now has and is responsible - and the Board of Governors are responsible in Parliament as it now is, what would be the advantage for CARTB to have it, why do they want to change.

MR. COYNE: In other words, you suggest that this board would be regulating broadcasting in the public interest in the same way the CBC now regulates broadcasting and public interest?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, your question was if it was precisely the same in every way.

MR. COYNE: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, we do not make any change or do we.

MR. COYNE: I'm asking you.

MR. WRIGHT: If it is precisely and identically the same I cannot see any change.

MR. COYNE: The point arises mainly for this reason, the CARTB in their brief to the Commission have suggested just that, in the sense they have recommended this separate body but have not specifically recommended any amendments to the present broadcasting act as far as regulatory powers are concerned, they just want to see the powers shifted to this other body.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, would they use the same personnel, the CBC Board of Governors?

MR. COYNE: I am not sure of that.

MR. WRIGHT: That sounds very much like the Farmers Union when it used to be the United Farmers of Canada and they lost the C.C.F. and a lot of Liberals got out and they said it was the C.C.F. but it was not but it was the same thing but we had a reason for changing it. What is the reason for changing it, don't they like the present name?

MR. COYNE: What you are suggesting is, if there are no changes as far as the organization is concerned it makes no sense to establish a different board.

MR. WRIGHT: Well if you have a different board it is for some different purpose, is it not?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think what Mr. Wright is

saying is, if it is going to be the same why change it, is that not it?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, unless there is some reason for changing the name as we have.

MR. COYNE: Turning now to page 16, your point number 11:

"The Saskatchewan Farmers Union recognizes that the amounts of money provided by the Government in Canada to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for Television broadcasting must be considerable----"

Have you any suggestions or recommendations as to how much money out of public funds in fact should be made available? Do you think there should be some sort of lump sum or a limit imposed upon the amount of tax monies?

MR. WRIGHT: Oh, of course, there should be a limit on everything.

MR. COYNE: It is several years now that the CBC per capita assessed at 50¢ out of the tax money on a scale of development that the CBC suggested some years ago in which - it was \$15 per television home.

MR. WRIGHT: Then I was talking about radio before television came in.

MR. COYNE: I think it was \$1 per capita.

MR. WRIGHT: It worked that way didn't it?

MR. COYNE: Yes, I think so, that was the recommendation of the prior commission that they should receive \$1 per capita.

MR. WRIGHT: Do you know what it works out to now on television with the tax money?

MR. COYNE: Well, my recollection is that the total budget is in the neighbourhood of forty-five million dollars or fifty million dollars this year.

THE CHAIRMAN: Actually, as I recall it, it was in the order of thirty million dollars plus their commercial revenue.

MR. COYNE: That is in television.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Could I put it this way, does your organization feel that the CBC should be provided out of public funds with sufficient funds to do an adequate broadcasting job?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, and also as we have said for a period over five years so it can plan ahead.

MR. COYNE: Have you given any consideration at all to the method in which these monies should be provided, for instance, has the question of possibly a receiving licence fee been considered by your organization?

MR. WRIGHT: No, that has not been considered, we will make a note of that and we will be glad to take that up and write to you. I would not like to say anything--

MRS. LUND: I did take it up with the executive and they said so far in their thinking it had better come out of general taxation, they felt that it was a benefit to the citizens of Canada and as such it should come out of that fund. They also felt that if the job was done

adequately it would be of sufficient value that it would be acceptable to us.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no feeling among the farming community which is not as fully covered in either radio or television as the urban centres, than if it is paid out of the tax money that is unfair, they are paying taxes for something they are not getting, you have not run into this feeling.

MRS. LUND: I cannot say I investigated it fully in our membership but I did take it up with the executive and there is no feeling there at all but what it should come out of the general taxation. We could make a general survey of our members and let you know, if that would be of interest to you?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if you have taken it up with the executive you must be in touch with it. What we are putting the question for is that of the various methods of financing, licence fees is one of them and we are going to see if there is any feeling that that is a good thing or not and to my mind if there was anybody who would think it was not a good thing it would be the farmers.

MRS. LUND: I would be surprised if they did, we have no indication of it at all.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You have no particular objection either to the present excise tax, the 15% excise tax on radio and television sets and parts which is being handed over to the corporation.

MRS. LUND: No, anything I have heard, I think

everyone thinks that is quite reasonable.

THE CHAIRMAN: Except Mr. Wright as you have pointed out they need an assured amount and that is not an assured amount?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: It could only be complimentary to the total required.

MR. COYNE: On page 17 you say:

" The Saskatchewan Farmers Union, in addition to setting out the foregoing, wishes to put on record its appreciation of the extremely valuable special services to the rural population which the CBC have provided."

You list certain services as being worthy of special mention and addition and I would like to ask you whether or not the private stations also provide valuable special service to the rural population on a similar or dissimilar nature to that provided by the CBC.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, I pointed out in my brief that they provide service.

MR. COYNE: Special service to the rural populations.

MR. WRIGHT: They have started that recently in Saskatoon.

MR. COYNE: That is all, thank you.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: How recently?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, I do not know.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will ask them when they come later. I have one or two questions, I think for the purposes of the record would you give us some idea of the number of

members you have in the Saskatchewan Farmers Union?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, perhaps Mrs. Lund, the president of the womens' group will tell us.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just a brief statement.

MRS. LUND: It will be somewhere around 15,000, it varies because we have an early membership and they drop off as they go on. I might say as people join other people are not immediately renewing and so it fluctuates, I think that would be a fairly fair figure.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is this individual membership?

MRS. LUND: Ours is a family unit.

THE CHAIRMAN: You say 15,000, to use your figure as an approximation?

MRS. LUND: Well, that would be units not individual members - possibly double----

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTEE: Households.

MRS. LUND: Yes, man and his wife and each child over 14 and under 21. That would be one.

MRS. WRIGHT: It has been as high as 40,000 depending on the weather and roads.

MRS. LUND: You understand it is a yearly membership and as Mrs. Wright points out the weather makes it difficult for us to renew the membership and it is at a low ebb at the moment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Somewhere in the early part of your brief at page 4 near the bottom, you were talking about the CBC under some policies being required to confine itself to producing Canadian cultural programmes; when we were

in Vancouver I think we had a brief from the university there which put for the notion of Canadian culture as something a little different to the way in which you are using the word here. The argument that was put to us there was that Barbara Ann Scott and Rocket Richard were as much a part of the Canadian culture as Sir Ernest MacMillan.

MR. WRIGHT: I think that is true.

THE CHAIRMAN: And to talk of culture being highbrow or long hair was a misuse of the term, this was something that took in the whole of Canadian life and you are using the word "cultural" in the narrow sense here.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, it is a quotation, you see I would like to say this that with the definition you have just given of culture that the university gave we agree entirely, it is the whole part of life, but I was referring here to what Mr. Lewis, editor and publisher of the Canadian Broadcaster and Telescreen said.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see, I just wanted to be clear as to what you meant when you were using this, I take it, you agree with it?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. I think our view on culture if it is not defined here it is somewhat reflected in the very last paragraph on page 15.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, you are quite right. Well then, on page 16 you make a statement in item 10 concerning the future of radio mentioning the impact

that television had on radio and you say:

"This means it must change and adapt to the new circumstances and make new and imaginative contributions to the educational and cultural life of our nation".

Would you care to expand on that at all, as to what kind of new and imaginative contributions you were thinking of there?

MR. WRIGHT: No, I did not have specific ones in mind.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me put it this way, you feel that radio is not going to be crowded off by television that is has a continuing function to perform.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: But, it must adapt to the new circumstances of television being in the picture.

MR. WRIGHT: That is right, yes. For instance where people have television and radio and they want to see the hockey game they are naturally going to look at television, they are not going to turn on the radio and listen to it so that would give radio more scope -- we find when we listen to symphonies we would sooner hear it on radio than have it snowing all the time on the television screen especially last year with the blizzards we had.

THE CHAIRMAN: On page 12 you are talking about the importance of criticism of the CBC system or any other system of broadcasting and you say that the Saskatchewan Farmers Union does not hold a non critical attitude toward the broadcasting corporation. What you are making is a

plea for the constructive type of criticism. How do you ~~think~~ the people of Canada can make their critical appraisal of their institutions effective with such an institutions as the CBC, what is the technique for doing this?

MR. WRIGHT: Well through members of Parliament, through organizations that speak and are recorded, through letters to the newspapers and all the ways in which an impact is made.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see, I think that is all. This has been very interesting, Mr. Wright, Mrs. Wright and Mrs. Lund, we thank you for coming and presenting you brief and we will consider it.

SUBMISSION OF SASKATCHEWAN WOMAN'S
CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand Mrs. A. E. Peacock and Mrs. Aden Bowman are presenting the brief and we will start by marking the brief as exhibit 92.

EXHIBIT NO. 92: Brief of the Saskatchewan Woman's
Christian Temperance Union.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Peacock, I understand you are presenting the brief and would you care to present it by reading it or outlining it? Just do as you wish.

MRS. PEACOCK: If I might I will stick fairly close to my brief but there will be certain deviations.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen:

Whereas the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Saskatchewan, conscious of the increasing evils and appalled at the tendencies and dangers of intemperance, and interested in the education of the young, the elevation of public sentiment with respect to the cause of temperance, the reformation of the drinking classes by the Power of Divine Grace,

And whereas the Saskatchewan Woman's Christian Temperance Union, being interested in the health and welfare of our Nation, physically and spiritually, wish to present in answer to the various questions propounded as regards policy:

Inasmuch as the present method of granting Radio and Television Licenses, matters of regulatory discipline and policy lie within the jurisdiction of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, which constitutes a monopoly,

Whereas the said Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is at the same time a Corporation organized for the definite purpose of broadcasting and televising, and

Whereas the said Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has its own network of Broadcasting Stations across Canada, and

Whereas the privately-owned rank high in service to their communities,

We submit that in fairness to the public, better service would be given if the Federal Government appointed an Independent Commission (whose members have no financial relationship with any Broadcasting or Television Station) to administer all matters concerned with Broadcasting and Television in Canada.

With regard to the budget:

a. We believe the Government could grant a budget to the CBC yearly instead of them depending on funds as they do now.

b. More private stations and granting them network facilities would encourage more good Canadian programmes. We find our Radio and TV stations in Saskatchewan do much to bring out latent talent. Private radio stations have proved their worth in Public Service, but are limited by present restrictions.

c. As we understand it, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation must require great finances to maintain stations; build shows, and maintain staffs, etc. Would it be a solution in part, if time could be bought on stations privately owned and operated?

We should make it definite here that we consider the programmes which show the actual effects of alcohol are educational and therefore, worth while and we are not including these in the other programmes. We have listed many of the programmes we have seen and enjoyed and do you want me to read those?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think not, we have it before us.

MRS. PEACOCK: We would like also to say we appreciate the weather reports and the news and public service policies and I would like to add to that we would like to see more Canadian programmes, not with the effect of being taken over by the American programmes

but as an opportunity for Canadian people, Canadian artists to develop. In the matter of producing such programmes, in Saskatoon last year just before Christmas and again just before New Years the Saskatoon Police Department were responsible for showing the film "Drunk Driving" as a safety measure on our streets and highways and this was very well received. We thought that was a good idea and we think it would be wise in the interest of safe driving and safety on the streets to have more such programmes. In Moose Jaw also the film "One in Twenty Thousand" which deals with lung cancer and tobacco was previewed by various groups which included the Public Teachers from the Teachers College student teachers, church groups and Grad 12 students, their comments were most interest and indicate that such films are desired and appreciated. I would like to make mention also of the new show "Graphic" on the CBC TV, we consider it very educational and we feel that this type of programme is valuable and we commend the CBC for producing such programmes.

In summing up I would like to emphasize the following points: first that we do not believe that the CBC should be in competition with privately owned stations and at the same time be the regulatory body governing radio and television stations. We would suggest that they be one thing or the other but ~~not~~ both because it is difficult to be fair, impartial and unbiased when involved in both sides of the question.

Secondly, if the CBC is to produce but not transmit a national programme which could be supplied to

private stations, if they desire, then the CBC should be given a definite annual grant by the Government sufficient to produce a good programme but restricted enough so that the funds would be carefully administered.

(Page 2267 follows)

With regard to programmes showing drinking scenes, in watching television last Sunday I believe there were three different programmes showing drinking scenes, and I do know that in Saskatoon -- and I believe the local broadcasters would bear me out in the statement -- the public are objecting; indeed, there is quite a decided sentiment against drinking scenes. People who themselves do not object to a social glass do object to the scenes and to the frequency of these programmes on T.V.

Fourthly, we wish to stress the value of the privately-owned station. We think there should be more of them. The privately-owned station serves its community and surrounding districts in a way which C.B.C. could not possibly do. This past winter in Saskatchewan we had many bad storms some of which resulted in the loss of life. We are firmly of the opinion that had it not been for the privately-owned radio stations there would have been actually hundreds of additional deaths. The stations were untiring in their efforts; storm warnings were sent out continually; schools were warned the children must not attempt to go home, and when people were reported missing the stations broadcast the fact so that search could be made for them. In emergencies, we submit, nothing can take the place of the private station. The C.B.C., being national in its character, could never have given the time which our private stations did, and for free, as a community service.

Also the private stations are interested

in developing latent local talent, and in supporting community projects as evidenced by such programmes as the Amateur Hour, which not only provides an opportunity for local artists to perform over the air, but also provides thousands of dollars each year for T.B. work, and the A.B.C. Talent Show for Moose Jaw is of the same nature.

Further, privately-owned stations are interested in, and must operate economically if they are to make a profit, so expenditures are watched carefully, which we submit is not always the case in businesses which are subsidized by the Government.

We are grateful to those who have provided an opportunity for us to express our opinions on these matters, and we wish to extend our sincere thanks to them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mrs. Bowman.

MR. COYNE: Mrs. Bowman, you say under "Policy" that you submit that in fairness to the public better service would be given if there were a separate regulatory body: Could you explain in a little more detail why you think there would be better service to the public if there were a separate regulatory body?

MRS. BOWMAN: Well, I feel, sir, that since the C.B.C. are also broadcasting and administering the regulatory rules, it is a little difficult for them to be entirely unbiased in their regulations to private stations, and that the private stations, if not in competition with the C.B.C., would have a

little more right to serve the public in ways which they felt would be acceptable to the public in this particular part of the world.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you know of any cases where private stations have been prevented by the C.B.C. from giving service to the public that they wanted to give?

MRS. BOWMAN: I certainly could not produce any evidence to that effect.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are trying to get at the meaning of the words in your brief, and you say "in fairness to the public better service would be given if the Federal Government appointed an independent Commission . . ."; all we are asking is about the fairness to the public, and what better service?

MRS. BOWMAN: That is my opinion as I have expressed it. To produce evidence to that effect would, I think, be a difficult question.

THE CHAIRMAN: I thought you said the private stations already were giving excellent service?

MRS. BOWMAN: They are.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you know of no place in which they want to give more service and are being prevented?

MRS. BOWMAN: It has been suggested to me they may be able to do other things.

THE CHAIRMAN: What sort of things?

MRS. BOWMAN: I couldn't suggest at the moment, sir.

MR. COYNE: Do you think that private stations should be required to carry C.B.C. programmes?

MRS. BOWMAN: I think possibly they should have some choice in the matter. I am sure the private stations would not want to carry many of the C.B.C. programmes.

MR. COYNE: But in circumstances where, for example -- and perhaps there are some in Saskatchewan -- there are no C.B.C.-owned outlets . . .

MRS. BOWMAN: In Watrous.

MR. COYNE: Well, for example, in television, say that the C.B.C. in order to get these national programmes to the people of Saskatchewan is dependent upon a private station providing the facilities; as a matter of principle do you think that the C.B.C. should be able to require, if it is ever necessary, the private stations to carry those programmes so as not to deny to the people of Saskatchewan the opportunity to see or hear them?

MRS. BOWMAN: Well now, might I inquire, sir, when you say would it be fair to have the private stations "required" to carry the programmes, have you in mind some specific programme that is for the welfare and advantage of the people, or are you suggesting that the private stations should be required to carry all the programmes?

MR. COYNE: No. The present situation is that the C.B.C. can require private stations to carry C.B.C. programmes of national interest. In other words, if for some reason or other a private station in an area where C.B.C. had no outlet did not want to carry some programme of national interest, the C.B.C. could -- I don't think the circumstances arise,

certainly not frequently -- but they could require that station to carry it so the people in that area could see the programme.

MRS. BOWMAN: If it is of national interest I would say I think it should be carried.

MR. COYNE: Then you said you believed there should be more private stations, and you think this would encourage more good Canadian programmes. In television, for example, it has been emphasized to us that the cost of providing any substantial Canadian programmes is so heavy that without Government subsidy many of the programmes that we are used to seeing now simply would not be seen.

MRS. BOWMAN: May I ask a question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MRS. BOWMAN: I have been very anxious to know the reason why Canadian programmes would be more expensive.

MR. COYNE: Well, they are not more expensive, but the advertisers with the smaller Canadian market are not in the position to pay as much for a programme as they are in the United States. For example, a programme in the United States may cost \$30,000 and an equivalent programme in Canada only cost \$10,000, but whereas the American manufacturer is prepared to pay \$30,000 for the programme in the American market, a Canadian sponsor is not able to pay \$10,000 in the smaller Canadian market.

MRS. BOWMAN: I get your point. I still feel that Canadians have a responsibility to develop

their own abilities.

THE CHAIRMAN: But I think Mr. Coyne's question is, in order to see the production of Canadian programmes would your organization be prepared to support the notion of public money going into the creation of these programmes?

MRS. BOWMAN: Of course, I can't speak for our group as a whole, because that question was not put to them. Personally, I feel it is high time Canadians were willing to develop character and to put some money into doing so.

THE CHAIRMAN: In your brief you said you would like to see more programmes produced in Canada: We are just adding to that "at public expense, if that is needed"?

MRS. BOWMAN: I would suggest so.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure that was your point, Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Yes, it was, Mr. Chairman. Mrs. Bowman, just one final question. In your list of programmes at page 2 of your brief, I suppose a good many of those programmes which you list as, I take it, being commendable from your point of view ...?

MRS. BOWMAN: Permissible at least.

MR. COYNE: A good number of these programmes are C.B.C. programmes?

MRS. BOWMAN: Yes.

MR. COYNE: The television programmes reach you in Saskatoon and Regina through the private station outlet?

MRS. BOWMAN: That is right.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: There is only one question I have, and that is that we have heard throughout these various hearings in the various cities we have been to numerous complaints about violence and shooting and murder and one thing and another being shown. There is no mention made of any such subject in your brief, and I wondered if you had anything to say on it?

MRS. BOWMAN: Except that we say we should safeguard the viewing of our younger citizens.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes. I think it was in Vancouver where the Lone Ranger was taboo with certain people because of the shooting, and I see you have it in for the older children?

MRS. BOWMAN: I think the older children are going to shoot anyway, and the purpose behind the Lone Ranger is a good one, so we conceded to that. However, I do think the matter of murder and violent things that go on could definitely be kept from the young people.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You also say: "Alcoholism is a national problem and pushing or advertising liquor products is selling further the principle of alcoholism", but, of course, you realize that under the Act there is no advertising of liquor or beer permitted?

MRS. BOWMAN: Yes, sir, in the sense there is no advertisement connected with it.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: No.

MRS. BOWMAN: But it is the thought that

it is put before them as an acceptable social thing, and therefore the trend would be to follow that and result in the alcoholism. I stand corrected, because I realize that the actual advertising is not there.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have a couple of questions, Mrs. Bowman. In your remarks, not in your brief, but I took you down as saying, you thought the C.B.C. should not be in competition with private stations and at the same time regulators?

MRS. BOWMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: We had another brief this morning in which the contention was put forward that the publicly-owned and privately-owned enterprises are for the most part, and for day-to-day practical purposes, co-operating members of the same system -- that the two are complementary.

MRS. BOWMAN: In many things they do work together.

THE CHAIRMAN: I realize you are not in the technical side of radio or television, but we have been anxious to find out where there is competition between the private and the publicly-owned stations, and also what form of regulation is objected to. If you haven't anything to add to these specific things, don't hesitate to say so.

MRS. BOWMAN: I don't believe I have much specifically to add, but I do feel very definitely that the C.B.C. is a two-sided thing -- the regulations and the broadcasting -- and I cannot at the moment

think of any other line of business in which that would be true -- that they should both administer and compete. I am not suggesting specific competition against the private station, but competing in the sense of earning money through those outlets.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you have no particular form of regulation that you have in mind that is harmful to the private stations?

MRS. BOWMAN: There again I am not an authority on the matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I just wondered if you could expand on it at all.

MRS. BOWMAN: I have reason to think that there are certain fields possibly in which the C.B.C. stations do not entirely accept the same regulations that are applied to private stations.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I would doubt that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would doubt it too on any evidence we have had. You have no proof of this?

MRS. BOWMAN: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: One other statement you made: You said expenditures are watched carefully in private organizations but you submit that is not the case in publicly-owned corporations?

MRS. BOWMAN: Not always the case.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Do you have any evidence of that being the fact in the C.B.C.?

MRS. BOWMAN: I have a few small instances. I have always been brought up on the theory that if you watch the small expenditures the larger ones take

care of themselves, and I have felt at various times that people from the C.B.C. take too many trips out here with regard to certain matters that could very well be handled by a letter that would cost 5¢.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is that kind of evidence on which you base this statement?

MRS. BOWMAN: I happen to know a little bit about some of these trips, and I have felt very much they have spent hundreds of dollars where a few dollars would have covered the same situation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. We will consider your brief.

---The hearings adjourned at 12.45 P.M. until 2.30 P.M.

---On resuming at 2.30 P.M.:

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that Mr. Dyck of the Salvation Army has other appointments and would like to go first.

SUBMISSION OF THE SALVATION ARMY

APPEARANCE:

Mr. Edward Dyck

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dyck, you have a short memorandum, do you wish it to be filed or are you going to speak to it?

MR. DYCK: I think I will speak to you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will mark your brief as Exhibit 93.

EXHIBIT NO. 93: Brief of The Salvation Army.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you present your brief, please?

MR. DYCK: Thank you very much.

Mr. Fowler and gentlemen of the Royal Commission, I have not a brief, just a statement that I would like to bring this afternoon. Representing The Salvation Army for Saskatoon and Northern Saskatchewan as I do, it gives me pleasure to express on behalf of the Organization the outstanding support we receive from radio and T.V. in this community; CFQC-TV, CKOM and CFNS. The results are far-reaching. If there were time I could enumerate the many times

these stations have come to our aid in making known the various projects The Salvation Army becomes engaged in. We are privileged indeed to have such splendid and generous facilities in Saskatoon serving the less fortunate in partnership with us.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dyck, we are glad to have your statement. It is confined to a particular point and I do not think we have any questions to ask you on that point. We appreciate your coming. Thank you very much.

SUBMISSION OF STATION CFQC

APPEARANCE:

Mr. A.A. Murphy.
Mr. Vern Dallin.
Mr. Blair Nelson.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will mark your brief as Exhibit 94.

EXHIBIT NO. 94: Brief from Radio Station CFQC.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, I am not personally presenting this brief but for the record I would like to make a few remarks. My name is A.A. Murphy, General Manager of A.A. Murphy & Sons Limited, and our company owns and operates radio station CFQC and CFQC-TV. I have been in the radio business since 1923 and I have grown up with it. There are only four or five of us who started in the radio business

who now operate under the original licenses. I thought that would be of interest to you. Before the C.B.C. came into being private broadcasting stations ran a network across Canada. I do not wish to enlarge on that, it is just a statement. In 1923 we commenced in the radio business with a 50 watt transmitter; a few years later we raised it to 250 watts, and later again to 500 watts and then to 1,000 watts, and finally to 5,000 watts to give service to the listening audience in this area. I have a brief here which covers the history of CFQC which has gone from 50 watts up to 5,000 watts, and it is a very interesting piece of literature and I would appreciate very much if you gentlemen could find time to read it because I am sure you will find it interesting.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not the same as your brief?

MR. MURPHY: No, we have supplied you with enough of these copies to do it. It is a little history of my station but it is, again, really a history of private radio stations in Canada. We will have 30 more copies sent to you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well, let us mark that as Exhibit 95.

EXHIBIT NO. 95: History of Radio Station CFQC.

THE CHAIRMAN: You will send the other copies along?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, they will be available. It gives a sort of history of private radio over the

years. Now with T.V. we have a completely different story to tell. On December 5, 1954 we started in the T.V. business and at that time the moment we hit the air we were really grown up, there was no growing up about it, we were really in our adult stage, and it has been a rather hectic business ever since. In the brief which we prepared for you we list a few of the services rendered by a local station to the people in the listening area, and these services could never be attained by a national network. I think that has been said two or three times before today.

I wish now to introduce to you my son-in-law, Mr. Verne Dallin, who has been with me for twenty-one years and is now Manager of radio station CFQC. At the same time I should like to introduce to you Mr. Blair Nelson, who has been with me for eleven years, my son-in-law, and he is now Manager of radio station CFQC-TV. I am asking these gentlemen to present the brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Murphy.

Mr. Dallin, will you start next? Do it in any way you wish.

MR. DALLIN: Mr. Fowler, ladies and gentlemen, this brief is presented with the purpose of showing the role of a privately-owned radio and television station in the community.

CFQC Radio commenced operation in July of 1923 as a 50 watt station and developed through these years under the same ownership and management to its present status of a 5,000 watt station. CFQC-TV first

commenced with a test pattern on Saturday, December 4th, 1954, and the first programme was on Sunday, December 5th, 1954. At the present time the combined personnel of CFQC, AM and TV numbers seventy-four.

The development of CFQC-TV will be outlined later in this brief. We would first like to outline some of the highlights in the policy of CFQC Radio.

Through the years CFQC has always kept in mind the policy of giving the best service possible in every way to the people of this community and the surrounding territory reached by our transmitting signal. We have always endeavoured to present a balanced programme which would satisfy the taste of the majority of our listening audience as well as many of the minorities.

In giving this service to the community, "news" was developed as one of the main features of this station. This part of our programming is dealt with in a separate section in this brief.

In the rest of our programme no particular phase of entertainment or information is stressed in particular as we feel that we must give as much variety as possible to our listeners.

In outlining the services a station like CFQC gives to the community we feel that it can best be demonstrated by a specific example. During the past winter the Prairies experienced some of the worst storms in the memory of even the oldest pioneers. Radio warnings of these storms approaching were broadcast by all private radio stations on the

Prairies together with special information and instructions from the R.C.M.P. and local authorities. As a result of these warnings we were told by those in authority that the loss of life was kept to a bare minimum. This is just one example of many where a local private radio station has rendered invaluable service to a community.

This station has also endeavoured through the years to promote as many local artists and special events as possible. Many of the people who started their radio careers on this station have gone on to attain national and international fame. Among them are -

Two piano teams, Reginald Bedford and Evenly Eby, also Thelma Johannes and Edmund Assalay; and Gail Meredith, Lorraine McAllister, Erna Friesen, Alberta Slim, Deltra Eamon, Bill Steinson, Doreen Hayes, Vida Guthrie, Fred Hill, Herb Pauls, and many others. Joyce Hahn and the Hahn family made their first appearance before a microphone on CFQC. Art McEown and his Farmer Fiddlers; The Primrose Ranch Gang; Jack Padget and his Melody Round-up Boys; Leo Smuntan and his orchestra; Ken Peaker and his orchestra, are just a few of the orchestras. Many amateur performers appear weekly over the Town & Country Show, and on the A.C.T. Amateur Programme.

CFQC pioneered school broadcasting in Saskatchewan over twenty-two years ago. CFQC together with the station then called CJRM carried a half-hour school broadcast from Regina over a two-station

network. Later when the C.B.C. came into being this school broadcast was taken over by a different department and six private stations in Saskatchewan carried the school broadcasts. When CBK at Watrous, a 50,000 watt station began operating it also carried the school broadcast. The signal from this station is so strong that it blankets the whole area and can be picked up by any school radio in this part of the Province. This meant that from 2.00 to 2.30 P.M. five days a week the only radio programme our listeners could hear in this territory was the school broadcast. We therefore decided that a choice should be given to those who were not interested in school broadcasts, so discontinued broadcasting these programmes over our station in order to offer an alternate service to the listeners in this territory.

The following section of this brief outlines the operation of our news service. There is also attached a list of organizations which have acknowledged assistance from us from time to time. These organizations were given free time on the air. Many of them were also given very considerable cash donations from time to time. Letters of thanks from these organizations are on file in our office.

This attached list on pages 1L and 2L, there are 83 there and it does not include the number of small meetings like the local Ladies' Aid meetings from time to time. I am not going to read the section on news as it is one of our main features. I will just give you some of the highlights in a resume

form. CFQC pioneered news in Northern and Central Saskatchewan and was one of the pioneers in Canada in this type of service. In 1941 we set up a full-scale radio news personnel covering local and district events in and around Saskatoon, and were one of the first to enter into this field. We have a full-time staff of 11 and one part-time announcer employed in the news service who handle both radio and television six days of the week. The news service is responsible for 25 radio programmes per day and on Sunday, 8 programmes. On television there are 3 programmes a day seven days a week, and this adds up to 24 hours of information per week on news, sports, weather and special events. This does not include play-by-play sports broadcasts which are also the responsibility of the news service.

To give you an idea of what our staff breakdown is in the news department there is a director, an assistant director, a television news editor, a sports editor with an assistant; four reporters, two of whom do a substantial amount of air work; a secretary who appears on the air daily with the birth announcements, and two beginners who are being trained in announcing, reporting and editing. CFQC is entirely self-reliant in the coverage of local events and matters of provincial affairs, and there is contact by telephone throughout the Province and on important matters anywhere in the North American Continent. Recently with the fire in Ottawa, when the plane crashed into the building, our news service telephoned

to Ottawa and got them to go out and make a special broadcast from the scene to our listeners here over long-distance telephone lines.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was that another station in Ottawa they went to?

MR. DALLIN: Yes, we went to another station in Ottawa. I might point out here that in covering these special events, in the last Federal election CFQC had the unique position of advising its listeners 40 minutes before the Canadian Press that the Liberal Government had been re-elected.

THE CHAIRMAN: I must be around here during the next election.

MR. DALLIN: We use two types of teletype service, Broadcast News and British United Press. CFQC has one of the largest private news rooms in Canada, a separate recording studio for the news and two portable tape recorders for on-the-spot work.

For television, local film is taken almost every day, still pictures every day, and the still picture file has almost 7,000 photographs from all over the world. We wrote to and received pictures from the Communist Government in China and from the Kremlin; we did that on our own and have these pictures on file. The national and international news film is obtained through Television News Film Co-operative.

One thing I would like to bring to your attention is that we have received four awards for news presentation. In 1952 we received the distinguished achievement award from the Radio and Television

News Directors' Association, which is a predominantly American Association. This was in competition with radio stations throughout the United States, Canada and Australia.

In 1953 we won the top award for radio news in competition with American, Australian and Canadian stations.

In 1954 we won it the second time.

In 1954 we also won the Beaver award from the Canadian Broadcaster and Telescreen magazine for establishing its own editorial programme. All radio news and sportscasts are thoroughly edited, the senior staff member is on duty at all times and our four men engaged in presentation of the news are there. Our presentation of the news is accurately presented, completely factual and impartial.

Now Mr. Nelson will present the television part of the brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well. Mr. Nelson?

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen, since its starting day - December 5th, 1954, CFQC-TV started with a complete list of live programmes including two half-hour women's shows, one children's half-hour show, both Monday through Friday, live news twice a day, weather and sports daily.

In its second year, CFQC-TV added one half-hour local show Monday through Friday, a second complete weather round-up daily, and the two-hour Town and Country Show on Saturdays. Since the beginning

we have had only one camera and our staff are all local people. We felt we would be successful only if we became an integral part of the community, through live shows, local news, and an eagerness to serve our area in every way. We felt that local news comprised of still pictures and motion pictures, was vital. We believe in presenting anything and everything which is local in character and of interest to our people. Within the framework of live shows CFQC-TV has made a deliberate effort to include guests from its entire viewing area and has made the live programmes available for multitudinous public service work.

This help has not been in the form of "free" announcements, rather it has taken the shape of an all-out effort on the part of the staff to enter into the thinking and functioning of a particular organization and using film, photo and whatever facilities to the maximum, in order to accomplish the task of presenting the organization to the public. Attesting to the success of this effort are the scores of letters received by this station from local, regional and national levels of these many associations. Many examples may be cited, such as the following:-

In the 1955 report of Dr. Lotta Hitchmanova, Executive Director of the Unitarian Service Committee of Canada; of the many publicity and promotion agencies in Canada which have helped the USC to reach its budget, only four organizations in this country are given special mention. One of these is CFQC-TV.

Attesting to the extent of this communal

work, listed below are some of the organizations which have received assistance from CFQC-TV.

I am not going to read all those but there are about 65 listed.

In addition to those listed above there are many, many more worthwhile organizations within our viewing area which CFQC-TV has been only too happy to help in their various functions, monetary drives and public relations duties. Education Week in Canada, for example, provided CFQC-TV with an opportunity to not only make the people aware that such a week existed, but to provide a full week of items which presented our systems of education on different levels from kindergarten teaching techniques to post-graduate varsity studies.

National Book Week gave CFQC-TV an opportunity to present to its audiences various sources of book materials and in co-operation with the Saskatoon Public Library, to present the finals of a week-long contest of reading and book quizzes as a T.V. feature programme. Preliminaries of the book reading contest were held throughout the Public Libraries in the city.

Within the short time of eighteen months CFQC-TV has truly entered into the life and welfare of this community and area. Fully realizing the values of a television station such as this, CFQC-TV geared its operation along community-minded lines to the extent where on one single show this season, which is now in its 38th week, an average of forty

persons per week participate, for a round total of 1520 participants. During Christmas week alone members of choirs and pageants totalled over 400.

Thinking as well along the lines of local dramatic production, CFQC-TV has conducted experimentally, a series of dramatic productions using local persons, which included staging, rehearsal and finally performing, with one camera and graphics, numerous scripts based on Easter, Christmas and seasonal themes. Climaxing this experimental series was a half-hour production of the morality play "Everyman", performed on the evening of Good Friday.

I would now like to introduce Mr. Walter Romano, who is production manager, and he is going to present this to you.

MR. ROMANO: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, in the past year or so we have assembled on our staff persons who have a great deal of so-called fine art talent. These persons have gained employment with the television station and have been able to work at their own trade, so to speak, with brush in hand all the time, working in an atmosphere that is very conducive to creative thinking and creative behaviour. Using these persons we started on this series of extremely dramatic productions varying from ten minutes to half an hour and using our one cameraman to the maximum that in the interchange we can muster along with our art department, using a series of graphics, we have presented these dramatic productions and these have been labelled by members

of our community as network calibre productions. These are graphic illustrations that have been copied by photograph and these are used on live cameras in conjunction with graphic illustrations. These series we have found so successful that we have continued to add this type of person who requires employment and at the same time to be allowed to work with his fine art talent. We have continued to add this type of person to the staff and the experiment had been very well received and so successful in our opinion that we are looking forward to a great deal more work and a great deal more experimentation along the fine art line.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could we see those, please? How do you use these? Are these graphics used right on the screen, or do you take photographs from them and put them through?

MR. ROMANO: That particular illustration at the back, the series is live camera, they are much enlarged, of course, to be used on live camera and with graphic illustrations transposing scene to scene to give the effect of a multiple camera operation.

MR. NELSON: These are the photographs, reduced, of course, from a large scale.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for that.

MR. NELSON: May I continue?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. NELSON: From December 1954 to the end of May 1955 over 1,500 persons were guests of "Here

Comes Alma", a women's afternoon show telecast five days a week. Guests included representatives from most of the above mentioned organizations, plus local choirs, amateur musicians and personalities.

During the week October 9th to 15th, 1955 CFQC-TV extended an Open House invitation to every person within our viewing area to personally visit and tour our television plant. Well over 10,000 persons took advantage of this invitation and toured our station. As much as possible these persons were included in all the live programmes telecast those days.

On behalf of the Red Feather Campaign, Thanksgiving Day, Monday, October 10th was set aside for a three-hourlong community auction at which time CFQC-TV auctioned off goods to the value of several thousand dollars on behalf of the Red Feather Campaign Committee.

In the women's programme, Sallytime, telecast Monday through Friday more than 1,500 people representing different communities of interest and activity, have participated. In this way CFQC-TV has proved itself and it is continuing to prove itself a vital segment of this community. Its activities are not limited solely to telecasting, but members of its staff have availed themselves to such organizations as Home and School Associations, both in the city and rural communities for speaking engagements - Adult Education Division, as well as to many other organizations which are concerned with the welfare of the community in general. This aspect of CFQC-TV's service has proved vital since speaking engagements for

members of our staff are continually arriving, some as far in advance as for next winter.

For the past 30 weeks an average of 28 performers per show have participated in the weekly Town & Country Show, the greater majority of these 840 performers representing rural communities. Performers include singers, musicians, dancers, orchestras.

THE CHAIRMAN: You do not include in the 28 the studio staff?

MR. NELSON: No, sir, those are guests.

We are most gratified by the good acceptance of the national and local advertisers from whom we derive our entire revenue. Commercials in programmes are not only basic to our organization, but are interesting to the general viewing audience as well. The amount of public service in an area by a television station, (and/or radio station) as well as special programmes is in direct proportion to its revenue. It is our hope that we will be able to increase our advertising revenue by lengthening our daily schedule, and provide an even better service to our viewers.

(Page 2293 follows)



THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Murphy, is there anything you wish to add?

MR. MURPHY: I would like to make one remark: outside of our news department, the two stations are run absolutely independent of each other. They both fight for business.

MR. DALLIN: Mr. Chairman, if I may have permission, I would introduce the Director of the News Service, Mr. Cameron

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to add anything, Mr. Cameron, on the news?

MR. CAMERON: I don't think so.

MR. DALLIN: And also Mr. Kelly, programme director of the station. Both men are local "products", having received their education and instruction in Saskatoon.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I don't know to whom I should direct the questions, but I will direct them at large and whoever wishes to answer may do so. Could you tell me what is the radius of the coverage given by CFQC, the radio station?

MR. DALLIN: That is quite an interesting thing. In the Prairies on a frequency such as we have, 600, and a power of 5000 watts, it is almost unlimited. Some years back we broadcast a special programme to musicians throughout the country, and it was picked up by a convent at Aklavik on the mouth of the Mackenzie River. We received letters from Montana. We have received letters over the years from every town and post office in Saskatchewan,

but we cannot claim them as our listening audience and we don't pretend to. We claim we cover the north part of the province and part of the western part of Manitoba quite consistently.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you know whether your reception is better during the day time and poor at night?

MR. DALLIN: Yes, we are directional at night, and there are certain areas in a northwesterly direction and southeasterly direction which are drawn in. We broadcast unlimited sunrise to sunset, and the hours of sunrise and sunset are set by the Department of Transport. At night we are directional.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Has there been any explanation offered for the difference between day and night reception?

MR. DALLIN: Well, we are directional at night. That is why we don't get it as far.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the reason for that?

MR. DALLIN: That is peculiar to radio; that night reception is always better than day.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why are you required to be directional at night?

MR. DALLIN: Because of a station in Jamestown, South Dakota, and CJOR, Vancouver, on the same frequency.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a matter of a licensing regulation?

MR. DALLIN: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: What is the coverage on

the TV station?

MR. NELSON: We put up a very high tower. Our tower is 866 feet above average terrain, and with flat terrain such as we have in the prairies, if you do get a tremendous height you get that much broader coverage. Our thinking was here that we not only wanted to serve Saskatoon and its immediate vicinity, but felt we should serve as large an area as possible. This, of course, resulted in a much higher capital investment when we put up a tower the height we did and located it on what is really the only hill in this area; and in addition to that we had the problem of supplying the power and so on to this site; also the road into the area, and so on. However, with 100,000 watts of power we do have a tremendous coverage. Our contour line actually includes Prince Albert on the north and it goes down to almost midway between here and Regina to the south, and on the west it is just short of Rosetown, is our signal, and on the east the other side of Humboldt.

MR. de GRANDPRE: What is the radius in miles?

MR. NELSON: Our C-line is about 75 miles, but we do cover a considerably larger area than C-contours, and we do have a map showing the points we have received material from, and these are well outside our C-line. They have no other service.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any idea as to the quality of reception at the edges of your field?

MR. NELSON: On the very edge, of course, it is the same problem they have every place, that you have so much "snow" it is doubtful whether it is worth watching or not, but that is something which is not always prevalent, and, dependent upon atmospheric conditions, they sometimes do have a very good signal, but you can't depend entirely on it in fringe areas.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Is the radio station part of a network, either Dominion or Trans-Canada network?

MR. DALLIN: We are a basic station of the Dominion network.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And that means you have how many hours a week from the CBC?

MR. DALLIN: We carry -- in our last Report of Performance, the network -- this was taken off in January. Of course, this fluctuates, and it was sent in in January, the week of January 23rd, 1956, and we had two hours and fifty-five minutes commercial and nine hours and thirty minutes sustaining.

THE CHAIRMAN: These are from the network?

MR. DALLIN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Two hours and fifty-five minutes commercial?

MR. DALLIN: And nine hours and thirty minutes sustaining. There was more available to us if we had wanted to carry it.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Does that represent an average week?

MR. DALLIN: That is an average week, yes.

The commercial at that time was a little higher than it is now. The commercial work on the Dominion network has been going down considerably in the last year or so.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Coming back to your brief ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you leave this Dominion network -- are you through with that?

MR. de GRANDPRE: You go ahead, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to discuss the brief and then discuss the general points on networks, and so on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well, go ahead.

MR. de GRANDPRE: A perusal of your brief leaves the impression that a private radio station has a definite place in the community in that it plays a role in the community services, while on the national basis you don't appear to have such an importance, and I take it that you feel that the CBC plays a national role while the private station plays a role on the local basis?

MR. DALLIN: That is right.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you feel that, by and large, the system which has been established in Canada of providing national service through a publicly owned system through the private outlets is a sound approach to the broadcasting problem that we are facing in Canada?

MR. DALLIN: Well, I don't know whether I would like to express an opinion just that way on that question. That is the system under which we are operating at present, and any private

organization usually operates within the framework of whatever system there is in existence. We have no way of knowing, because we haven't operated in that way, whether this present set-up is the best way to operate a national system.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But have you been hampered in any way by the present framework in your activities?

MR. DALLIN: Not particularly.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just to amplify that a little bit, we are seeking advice and the experience of those who have been in the business for some time, and any one of you who would care to answer, please do so. To start with, do you feel that for Canada we need a national system of broadcasting?

MR. MURPHY: I would answer that, and say definitely yes. We are connected -- and I don't think that point was brought out -- we are a member of the Dominion network and we do a certain amount of national broadcasting through the Dominion network. We were originally on the Trans-Canada network when there was one network, and then, when they decided to form a second network, we were naturally one of the key stations for them to shift from the Trans-Canada network to the Dominion network due to the fact we were only forty miles from Watrous, and if they were going to set up a second network it was a necessity that they had us on the Dominion network, and we left the national network and we left a much bigger volume of national business to go on the Dominion network than was on the national

network, because it had to be built up. However, in order to assist in forming a second network we decided to move over, so that a second network could be formed. We have always done our bit with the CBC from a national point of view.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is one of the questions I was going to bring out. The brief is a very interesting one, though it does not in any place mention the national side of your tie-up.

MR. MURPHY: We presented that brief with the express purpose of throwing a local atmosphere into it; but, from a national point of view, no station in Canada has done their bit any better than we have towards national broadcasting.

-

(Page 2300 follows)

-

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Did you suffer financially from the transfer from Trans-Canada to Dominion?

MR. MURPHY: We did at the time, yes, because Trans-Canada was a network fully operating and the Dominion network had to be built up.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, the Dominion network was built up and is now decreasing in value again, is that correct?

MR. MURPHY: Well, it built up and with the advent of television it has very much depreciated; I do not know what is really going to happen to it ultimately.

THE CHAIRMAN: What do you think ought to happen to it?

MR. MURPHY: I am not going to express an opinion on that.

THE CHAIRMAN: The real question is, a man who has probably had as many experiences as anybody in the country, is there a need, a national need, for two radio networks today, in your opinion?

MR. MURPHY: Well, I will answer that in this way, that when we went into the television business we were in opposition to ourselves and we in the radio station knew that we had to start to fight and fight hard. We have had one salesman on the radio station before the advent of television, now we have three. We are out for the dollar in the radio station against the television station just as hard as we can fight, and we have to fight

to get it, and I think they failed down there to get the business, if you would like my opinion of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I am interested to know what the view of individual private operators is as to -- there seems to be at times an indication that they are not too happy about the Dominion network and in some ways not too happy about the CBC, and I would like to know whether they would feel they would be better off without the Dominion network?

MR. MURPHY: Well, I would not like to see the Dominion network folded up myself, I think it has a place, I think it could be revived, that is my opinion, because in our radio station business against our television station business the first months we dropped off considerably, but I can assure you we gained that all back.

THE CHAIRMAN: You see, I have had some impression that there was a good deal of criticism being levied against the Dominion network, sort of taking up time private stations would like to have free, and it is certainly costing the people of this country some money, and if it is then the question naturally is should it be abolished or not?

MR. MURPHY: Well, if it cannot do better than it is now I am afraid something will happen to it, not that I would like to see it.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the answer to my question, then?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you think it is the temporary impact that TV had on radio and that it

will finally recover from this blow, or do you think it is lack of salesmanship?

MR. MURPHY: I think it is a little bit of both. I think if we revert to the United States, they went through that cycle in the United States; their radio business went down and came back up again. I think after the first flush of TV passes by that the people will again come back to their radio sets to a greater extent than they are now. I do not think TV will ever blank radio out anywhere in Canada or the United States.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But you seem to run a parallel between the American stations and the Canadian stations. Do you know if the decline on the radio network or networks lasted more than a year or a year and a half or two years because we are still in, as you said, the flush of television in Canada almost across the country, and is it a fair conclusion to say that it is lack of salesmanship because there has been a drop or do you know personally that there has been lack of salesmanship to sell the Dominion network?

MR. MURPHY: Well, the TV has affected the Dominion network to a very great extent, probably to a much greater extent than it has affected me as a private station fighting against myself in the two fields, but as I told you, we put a very great effort back into the radio business when we entered the TV field. Now, maybe it is not available down there -- I am not going to say it is lack

of salesmanship down there, it may be a condition that cannot be overcome, but nevertheless, it has an effect.

MR. DALLIN: It could be a lack of more aggressive salesmanship.

THE CHAIRMAN: The thing we are really asking you, are you looking at the decline in let us say the Dominion network and saying, "Sure, there has been TV but this must be a lack of salesmanship", or do you know of your own knowledge of a decline in salesmanship or a failure to get accounts that can be had? Are you just guessing at the lack of salesmanship or is it something on which you have some evidence?

MR. MURPHY: Well, we are not close enough to it to say.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you jumping to the conclusion or is this something on which we can draft some positive facts?

MR. MURPHY: We are jumping at conclusions.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Is this decline levelling off now or is it still going down-grade?

MR. DALLIN: As far as the commercial network business on the Canadian network it is still on the down-grade.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Do you believe there is a possibility of substituting a private network for the declining network?

MR. MURPHY: I would hate to try to answer that.

MR. de GRANDPRE: May I put the same

question in another form: is there a market in Canada for two competing networks?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Do you mean two? There are two now.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I mean an extra network.

MR. MURPHY: I am not close enough to the situation to answer that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, let me put it another way, you are not agitating at the moment to hook up in a private radio-TV network, that is not part of your business on the national basis?

MR. MURPHY: You are speaking of TV?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, radio -- that is not one of the projects of your station at the moment?

MR. MURPHY: Not at the moment, no.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You do not feel you need a network in order to operate a private network?

MR. MURPHY: Well, I would say yes; we can operate without a network.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, I see that you have developed a very substantial news department in your organization and you are probably one of the most qualified groups to answer this question about the influence of sponsorship on news. What is the result of a news broadcast when it is sold to a sponsor, does that have any effect at all on the character of the news?

MR. DALLIN: I can answer that with a very definite example; we had a bread company in Saskatoon -- well, Western Canada, the McGavin Bread

Company, sponsoring our news at 7.45 to 8.00 o'clock in the morning for about five years. Shortly after they engaged the newscast they were in the middle of a lawsuit in Calgary and for several days the lead item after the commercial from McGavin's Bakery was the suit they were in in Calgary, and some of it was not very complimentary to the bread company, but the sponsor said nothing to us and we never even thought to ask the sponsor whether he wanted it or not. We would not have tolerated it if he had said it could not go on. That is the actual complete, factual, impartial news, that is what we broadcast, and the sponsor cannot influence the news content one way or the other.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, apart from the one example, which is an interesting one, just so the record is complete, Mr. de Grandpre's question was, have you had any experience of a sponsor interfering with the slanting or direction of the news?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Or even trying to?

MR. DALLIN: Just a minor case where someone might, a sponsor might say that he did not want somebody's name mentioned because he was in a motor accident, and that is as far as they got, and we just told them if it was news then we would not interfere with it. I did not communicate with the news department, I was the one that was phoned, and I do not think Mr. Cameron has had a case where anyone has tried to influence his writing.

MR. CAMERON: Not sponsors, we never

hardly even talk to them.

MR. DALLIN: Our news setup is quite unique, they are a little empire unto themselves as long as they keep themselves out of mischief.

MR. de GRANDPRE: It has been suggested to us by some organizations that the fact that the CBC is a public corporation it could mold the opinion of the public and have some influence on the news, whether the news would be carried on their own stations on the network or even on the private stations to some extent. Could you comment on that?

MR. DALLIN: Well, we do not carry any CBC news.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But does the CBC interfere with your news?

MR. DALLIN: Oh, no, we beat them so badly in this area that we have more listening audience for the news from our station because we have such a complete service, and we pay very little attention to the CBC news except occasionally monitoring it to see if they have a particular story that we have not.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: How do you get your national news?

MR. DALLIN: We have two services, the Broadcast News Service, a teletype service, and British United Press, as well as phone calls and reporters around the province. You see, you can have a news room without having a news service of your own. You can have a teletype in there and broadcast it as it comes off the line, then you

are broadcasting your news service from a news room, but when you have a news service you go out and get your news yourself.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Is that Broadcast News, is that Canadian Press?

MR. DALLIN: Yes, specially prepared for radio stations.

(Page 2308 follows)

MR. de GRANDPRE: Knowing that most of the news on the CBC is news of national or international interest, do you remain within the news of the province or of the western provinces, or do you also give national and international news on your news service, or do you concentrate on the local news?

MR. DALLIN: Well, of course, we do give great preference to local, but our newscasts are built in several ways. In fact, we have two newscasts, which are half an hour in length, and the first one is called The World To-day, divided into three ten-minute periods, and the first one of national and international scope. The second one is on provincial and regional or local, and the third part, on sports. We have another one similar to that. In the shorter newscasts, depending on the issue, say a newscast of five minutes, depending on the issues involved it is whether we give the international or national story first play, or whether we give the local one. Probably we would give more preference to local in a five-minute broadcast than we would to international, unless it is something like a revolution or war or national disaster.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Are all your newscasts sold or are some of them on a sustaining basis?

MR. DALLIN: I can't say offhand, but I was looking the other day and I think there was one that was not sold.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I see that your brief

does not refer to the CARTB brief; it does not say whether you approve or disapprove or whether you dissociate yourselves with the contents of it; what is your position on this?

MR. MURPHY: The CARTB brief was submitted to all the stations for approval or disapproval, and I think it was accepted by the majority of the stations as a whole, and we raised no objection to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you have no particular submissions to make on the points covered in the brief?

MR. MURPHY: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: By all means go into it if you wish, Mr. de Grandpre.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Well, I don't want to be unfair to the witnesses if they are not particularly prepared to go into it. Unless they particularly wish me to go into it, I will not -- unless you have any questions, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, no. If we can get any added opinion or view or help in connection with points raised by the CARTB from any private station, we welcome it, but I don't think we are going to press anyone.

MR. MURPHY: I have nothing to add to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see. Well, I find that I did have half a dozen things here, but they have all come up in the course of Mr. de Grandpre's questions or during our interjections. We thank you very much for the full submission you have made about your situation, and the brief will be considered.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have two short submissions left, and the first one is from the Associated Canadian Travellers.

SUBMISSION OF THE ASSOCIATED CANADIAN
TRAVELLERS

THE CHAIRMAN: We will mark your brief as Exhibit No. 96.

EXHIBIT NO. 96: Brief of The Associated Canadian Travellers.

MR. MULLIGAN: Mr. Chairman, first I would like to introduce myself. I am Mr. Angus Mulligan, TV Director of Saskatoon Associated Canadian Travellers Club, and I am here on behalf of Mr. Kearns, a representative of the Saskatchewan TB League.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, please.

MR. MULLIGAN: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission and ladies and gentlemen, during the past fourteen years the Saskatoon Club of the Associated Canadian Travellers have with the co-operation of Radio Station CFQC been one of the leaders in the Province of Saskatchewan in the programme for the prevention of tuberculosis, and we would like to present some facts and figures on same.

We have operated the A C.T. -- CFQC Amateur Shows for the past fourteen years. We have visited and revisited 280 towns and villages and have had 3300 persons appearing and reappearing before the CFQC microphone. We have held 13 final Amateur Shows in Saskatoon with the winning

contestant from each town each year appearing in the final. During this period of fourteen years we have travelled 64,000 miles to put on these shows, leaving some time Saturday afternoon and returning early in the morning of Sunday or as late as Sunday evening. During this time we have nearly always had the same announcer from Radio Station CFQC, Mr. Wilf Gilbey, to whom we are deeply indebted. Mr. Gilbey has moved to Swift Current, but while he was with us for the fourteen years we average fifteen shows a year and he missed two shows in the whole fourteen years. We have now with us Mr. Frank Callaghan, who has come to our assistance and is capable of taking Mr. Gilbey's place. We have had only one or two cancellations of shows until this year when road and weather conditions made travel impossible.

It is only by the wonderful co-operation of Radio Station CFQC who have donated over 800 free hours of radio time to the cause of T.B. prevention that all this was made possible. This 800 does not include plugs and so forth during the week that they give us free, where they will talk about the town we are going to visit and the next show, and keep reminding the people that we will be coming to the town, and so forth.

The total raised by the Saskatoon Club A.C.T. and turned over to the Saskatchewan Anti-T.B. League is over \$192,000, while the five A.C.T. Clubs of Saskatchewan have now turned over to the League a total of over \$817,000. This money pays for the T.B. Massed Surveys that are held throughout the province and which has been so successful and

has dropped the T.B. death rate in Saskatchewan to 4.7 per 100,000 persons, the lowest in Canada.

When we started these shows the death rate in Saskatchewan was approximately 450 people per year, and last year it was 42 deaths from T.B.

May I, on behalf of the Saskatoon Club of the Associated Canadian Travellers and the Saskatchewan Anti-T.B. League express our sincere thanks to CFQC for the kindness and co-operation in helping us to stamp out this dread disease of tuberculosis, and it is our wish that our friendship which has lasted for so many years will continue in the years to come. It is only by the wonderful kindness shown by Radio Station CFQC that all the progress made in this prevention work has been accomplished.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Mulligan. Just as a matter of interest, it is true, is it not, that the attack on tuberculosis has been going on in Saskatchewan for even before the fourteen years you mentioned in your activities? I seem to recall when I was here in 1937 and 1938 that the records then put Saskatchewan very high up on the list in attacking tuberculosis.

MR. MULLIGAN: Well, I would like to give you the story about how this came about, how the A.C.T. got into this raising money to fight T.B. It was on a snowbound train from Regina to Winnipeg. There was a group of A.C.T. representatives on this train and they were sitting around talking and wondering what they could do to help, and there happened

to be a doctor who was on the train and he overheard them and he got up and spoke to them and told them the need for fighting T.B., and from that time on that was the objective of the A.C T. Clubs of Saskatchewan, which has done a tremendous job in fighting this dreadful disease.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Mulligan. Your submission is on a special point and we are interested in having it. We have no questions for you.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: I would like to ask a question. You refer to the wonderful co-operation of radio station CFQC, who have given over 800 hours of free time, but how are you actually raising the money?

MR. MULLIGAN: We go out Saturday nights to a local town, it could be one hundred miles or a hundred and fifty miles, it all depends, and we put on amateur shows; we will have anywhere from twelve to fifteen contestants, and we broadcast these from approximately 9.30 to 2.00 o'clock, it all depends how well the money is coming in. If the money keeps coming in we will keep on broadcasting.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Do you mean you pay admission?

MR. MULLIGAN: No, the way we arrange it is, the contestants come up by number and the people will give money to the different contestants whom they wish to hear or put their money on, and the way we get our winner is that the contestant

who raises the most money is our winner, and that is the one who comes into Saskatoon for the finals.

THE CHAIRMAN: But it is the listeners ---

MR. MULLIGAN: The radio listeners.

THE CHAIRMAN: Who pick a special contestant?

MR. MULLIGAN: We have had many from the United States for a contestant, sometimes they won't ask for a particular contestant, they will send in \$5 and say, "Put it on any contestant"; all that money goes into the Anti-T B. League.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: The amateurs do not get paid?

MR. MULLIGAN: No, they give their contribution by being present, and the only thing they have is to try to get to Saskatoon for the final show and the winner in the final show in Saskatoon gets what we call our Orange-Crush rose bowl, and that is given to them for being the winner. This year I am bringing before the Board of Directors something new, the cup has always been going from the contestant from the town who has raised the most money; there has never been any thought given to the best contestant in music or in singing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Quality?

MR. MULLIGAN: Yes, quality, so I am bringing in front of the directors to try and get another cup and have judges outside of our club, some local people to judge for the best quality in all our contestants and we will have two cups then.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Does that go on all

year round?

MR. MULLIGAN: No, our shows start in September and we generally end up in May, we have our final show in May. However, that could not be done this year, and this is another example of the co-operation of CFQC because we passed through a very severe winter, we had blizzards and snow storms and the roads were blocked and we had seven shows cancelled. We decided that, irrespective of the co-operation of CFQC, to carry on these shows to the end of June, and then hold our final show at the first of July, and they have gone along with us on this and given us the time right up to the end of June.

THE CHAIRMAN: Am I right in thinking these programmes are broadcast over the station?

MR. MULLIGAN: Yes, live broadcasts.

THE CHAIRMAN: And they provide the time free and they get the programme free?

MR. MULLIGAN: Yes, the only money that changes hands is the money that comes to the Anti-T.B. League, everything has been free, the service and the hours and also any little plugs they can give us during the week.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You say that goes on from nine o'clock to two o'clock in the morning?

MR. MULLIGAN: We have had it go as long as two-thirty or three o'clock in the morning.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: And the station stays on the air all that time to broadcast for you?

MR. MULLIGAN: Yes, our boys go out and

the announcers and the engineer go out and very often do not get home until Sunday afternoon; they have gone out and fought snow banks and mud roads. In one town last year the Travellers could not get through but the radio station got there and carried on with the show without the assistance of the Travellers.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

(Page 2317 follows)

SUBMISSION OF SASKATOON COMMUNITY CHEST
AND COUNCIL INC.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have one other short submission from the Saskatoon Community Chest and Council Incorporated. We have a letter from you, Mr. Porteous, and we will mark it as Exhibit 97.

EXHIBIT NO. 97: Submission by Saskatoon Community Chest and Council Inc.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you like to read it or summarize it, as you wish?

MR. PORTEOUS: Mr. Chairman, before I start on this, would it be appropriate for me to make a comment on the previous submission?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. PORTEOUS: I am on the committee that is conducting a T.B. mass survey in the city. The A.C.T. have told you how they raised the money. This week we are completing a survey where the Anti-T.B. League have put their mobile units into our city and we had to make a directory of every man, woman and child in the city, and at a luncheon meeting today we have been summing up and 55,000 people, or 80 per cent of our population, have had a free x-ray picture, as a result of the work done by the A.C.T. in raising this money. So, we in Saskatoon think this is a marvelous service.

"Mr. Chairman and members of the Royal Commission on Broadcasting, the Community Chest and Council has a dual role in Saskatoon; the chest functions to conduct an annual campaign for funds

for its fourteen participating member agencies, and the council function to bring together representatives from many organizations to study the health and welfare needs of the city.

"In order to gain widespread public support, both in fund raising and in the propagation of ideas leading to the betterment of community standards of health, welfare and recreation, all media of mass communication play a vital role.

"We have invariably found the radio and television stations of Saskatoon to be most understanding and cooperative, most generous in the allotment of time, and helpful in the preparation of material to be used.

"Prior to, and during our financial campaign we have had full cooperation in the broadcasting of all relevant material, both news stories of campaign progress, and interpretative material. The greatest portion of this has been given to us free of charge. So far as our paid advertising is concerned, such as spot announcements, we have been accorded a half rate charge. We would note that willing to take more paid time; only in this area have our requests been reduced.

"For our 1955 campaign we had free use of CFQC-TV facilities to conduct a radio auction for two hours on Thanksgiving Day. This netted \$1800 for our campaign. The staff of the television station directed our volunteer committee in setting up this project and all the staff seemed to

be on duty to conduct the show on our behalf.

"In addition, the station, on two occasions screened a twenty-five minute interpretative film titled "Who is my Neighbour", a NFB production and screened an all star one hour programme prepared in support of Community Chest campaigns by the CBC. Prior to and during the first week of the campaign, representatives of several of our agency boards were introduced and interviewed on "Sally Time" programme. The regular newscasts carried items of campaign organization and progress, quoting statements of our campaign leaders and flashing photographs during the broadcast.

"The radio stations generally have provided free time for five minute interpretative talks by members of our public relations committee, and, on occasion, as we were able to supply them, arranged interviews by their own staffs of campaign and agency personalities.

"Cooperation has also been given by the radio stations to insert into the commercials of regular advertisers "tag-lines" of fifteen and thirty seconds, containing the names and functions of the agencies in the joint campaign.

"Not only at campaign time, but throughout the year we have had the cooperation of the radio stations in arranging interviews, talks and newscasts of the work of our agencies as we could produce material that could be considered of interest to the general public, e.g. the YMCA on camping and

swimming programme and general interviews of personalities who visit the city; the John Howard Society opinions on probation and capital punishment, the Family Welfare Association on the need for visiting homemakers; V.O.N. interpretative talks throughout the year. In fact, during the winter months the V.O.N. have five minutes once a week on one of our stations free of charge.

"The Social Planning Committee of our Chest and Council has also enjoyed full cooperation in common with other community organizations. For example, during the week of May 6th, 1956, we conducted a Home Safety Week programme in conjunction with the Provincial Division of Health Education. A film was shown "Doorway to Death" which pointed up graphically many of the often overlooked hazards that cause accidents in our home. TV interviews were arranged with members of our committee, with the St. John Ambulance Association and representatives of the public health, fire, and police departments of our city. Throughout the week flash pictures were used calling attention to possible home hazards. The radio stations carried feature stories specially stressing the value of the Home Safety Check lists that were distributed through the public and separate schools.

"Recently, our City Council requested our Social Planning Committee to study the need for an S.P.C.A. in Saskatoon. Radio announcements have kept the public informed as to the progress of our

studies and have sought to determine the extent of a public conscience on this question by asking interested people to phone in their names for the purpose of preparing a mailing list for a public meeting to discuss this particular need.

"Throughout the ten years of my experience our difficulty has not been to secure radio and television time but to get enough interesting material to use up all the time that we have found to be readily available to us. This attitude of friendly understanding, cooperation, and assistance we have consistently experienced from management and staff members.

Respectfully submitted."

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: How many radio stations are there?

MR. PORTEOUS: There are three; CFQC, CKOM and CFNS, the French radio station.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: And you get the same cooperation from all of them?

MR. PORTEOUS: Always the same spirit of cooperation. Some we have used more than others. Our difficulty is to get our people to participate in these things. It is very hard to get people to go on television; it is something new to them and they don't like it, but as we can persuade people who have a message -- what they think is a message -- we have never experienced any difficulty in having these people on either radio or TV.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Porteous, we thank you

for your submission.

That concludes the Saskatoon hearings. We will adjourn now and plan to resume our public hearings in Toronto on May 30th; that is, next Wednesday.

I want again to express my appreciation to the Mayor and members of the Council for letting us have this excellent room for our hearings, and to thank those who presented briefs and those members of the public who were interested enough to come.

---The hearings adjourned at 3.55 p.m. until May 30th in Toronto, Ontario.

- - - - -

I N D E X

<u>SUBMISSIONS BY:</u>		<u>Page</u>
RADIO-PRAIRIES NORD LIMITEE	...	2184
M. Charles Papen		
M. Theodore Prefontaine		
SASKATCHEWAN FARMERS UNION.	...	2213
Mr. J.F.C. Wright		
Mrs. L.M. Lund		
Mrs. J.F.C. Wright		
SASKATCHEWAN WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION.	...	2262
Mrs. A.E. Peacock		
Mrs. Aden Bowman		
THE SALVATION ARMY.	...	2277
Mr. Edward Dyck		
RADIO STATION CFQC	...	2278
Mr. A.A. Murphy		
Mr. Vern Dallin		
Mr. Blair Nelson		
THE ASSOCIATED CANADIAN TRAVELLERS	...	2310
Mr. Angus Mulligan		
SASKATOON COMMUNITY CHEST AND COUNCIL INC.	...	2317
Mr. George Porteous		

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

<u>No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
90	Brief submitted by Radio-Prairies Nord Limitee.	2184
91	Brief of Saskatchewan Farmers Union.	2213
92	Brief of the Saskatchewan Woman's Christian Temperance Union.	2262
93	Brief of The Salvation Army.	2277
94	Brief from Radio Station CFQC	2278
95	History of Radio Station CFQC	2279
96	Brief of The Associated Canadian Travellers.	2310

ROYAL COMMISSION
ON
BROADCASTING

HEARINGS

HELD AT

TORONTO, ONT.

May 30, 1956

v. 15

ROYAL COMMISSION ON BROADCASTING

Toronto, Ontario,
May 30 - June 6, 1956.

PRESENT:

THE CHAIRMAN	ROBERT M. FOWLER
COMMISSIONER	EDMOND TURCOTTE
COMMISSIONER	JAMES STEWART

COMMISSION COUNSEL	JAMES M. COYNE
	A. J. de GRANDPRE

SECRETARY	PAUL PELLETIER
-----------	----------------

May 30, 1956.

SUBMISSIONS BY:

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO EXTENSION DEPT.
J.R. Coulter, Chairman, Television Ctee.
Dr. R.S. Harris, member " "

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO DEPT. OF FRENCH.
Prof. C.D. Rouillard
Prof. W.H. Trethewey
Father L.J. Bondy
Prof. E.A. Joliat
Prof. R.W. Jeanes

NATIONAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE STUDENTS
FEDERATION.
Edward S. Rogers

TELEVISION OWNERS' ASSOCIATION.
A.A. Marshall

TORONTO DISTRICT TRADES & LABOUR
COUNCIL.

Mr. M. Cotterill
Douglas Hamilton
Wm. Kearns

CANADIAN WIRE SERVICE GUILD.
Peter Reilly
Philip Calder

ONTARIO LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
CHILDREN'S SECTION.
Miss Jean Thomson
Miss M.B. Whiteman

ASSOCIATION FRANCE CANADA.
Dr. Gordon Bates
Madame A.T.G. Bryan

Hearings of the Royal Commission on
Broadcasting held at Toronto, Ontario,
in the Sir Daniel Wilson Residence,
73 St. George Street, commencing on
May 30, 1956.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we will now open the Toronto hearings of the Commission. We had announced these hearings as being the first of probably two sessions in Toronto. It now looks as though we may be able to get through the Toronto briefs during the period we are here this time. There are three days this week and at least two next week when we will be able to be sitting for any brief that we have ready to be presented. If there are others, and we have to come back, we will do so probably in September.

Just a word about our procedure. We try to start at 10.00 in the morning, go through till somewhere, 12.30 or quarter to 1.00, resume at 2.30, and on until 4.30 to 5.00. We have quite a number of number of briefs to present, and those who are presenting them are fully at liberty to do so as they may choose, either by reading the brief or by summarizing it and speaking to it, amplifying it if they wish.

When the brief has been presented, we then, both the Commissioners and our counsel, do ask questions. These questions are trying to get at the facts, and the opinions behind the submissions that are made. Necessarily you can examine only one witness at a time, and to some extent must appear to be examining from the opposite point of view in order to get the facts, but as I have said many times no one should try to read into any question any conclusion of the Commission. We have reached no

conclusion and will not do so until we have had all the facts, and also all the various private studies that we have undertaken, that are now underway and are being undertaken for us.

SUBMISSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
(EXTENSION DEPARTMENT)

APPEARANCES:

Mr. J.R. Coulter

Dr. R.S. Harris

THE CHAIRMAN: The first brief we are to receive this morning is from the Extension Department of the University of Toronto, and we will begin by marking it as Exhibit No. 98.

EXHIBIT NO. 98: Brief presented by the University of Toronto, Extension Department.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is to be presented by Mr. J.R. Coulter, the Chairman of the Television Committee, and Dr. R.S. Harris, member of the Television Committee.

Mr. Coulter, will you present the brief?

MR. COULTER: Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, I think the first thing that should be attended to is that this brief is not accurately from the Extension Department. It is from the University Television Committee as such. Perhaps because we have used the Extension Department letterhead, there has been that slight misunderstanding, but I represent the University Television Committee as it is, and Dr. Harris

is also here because he has been liaison man between the University and the C.B.C. on the programmes in which the University has been involved.

Now, I propose to summarize the brief, not to read it. My brief breaks down into four parts; the first part deals with television as an educational medium and especially applicable to the field of adult education. The second part of the brief deals with University of Toronto formal participation in television programmes up to this time. The third indicates the best possible way in our opinion for television to be utilized as educational medium by the University. And the fourth part of the brief is an actual summary of the recommendations made to the Commission.

There is not too much doubt about the fact that television is a very powerful educative medium. It has its limitations perhaps, since there is not that strong personal contact between teacher and student. There is not the possibility of discussion as there is in the classroom. The training and dialectic is not quite so obvious, in fact it is hardly possible at all. There is perhaps another danger, in that television in some instances, encourages certain passivity of mind, but there is a very strong advantage, and that is that objects can be portrayed at very close range, and the dramatization of facts or ideas is superbly done by means of television.

Another factor which I think pertains to this question is that universities have become more and more interested over the period of the last fifty

years or so in adult education. Adult education differs from undergraduate education in that interest and motivation are more or less assumed.

The universities have become deeply involved in this field in the United Kingdom and United States and in Canada, most universities consider that part of their responsibility is to the adult society. People not necessarily enrolled in regular daytime classes.

Now, the University of Toronto has been involved in formal television programmes since 1953. We have been involved in approximately forty half-hour programmes too, and I think the University of Toronto experience should be important in helping to formulate policy. In 1953 the University was involved in a series called "Varsity Story". There were ten programmes, and the purpose of these programmes was merely to inform the public as to what happens at a university. The audience was taken to the library or the lectures or to institutes, and they were merely shown what happens, what goes on at a university. In other words, the programmes were informational rather than purely educational.

In 1954 "Exploring Minds" as a series was begun, and we have had now three years of the Exploring Minds programme. The emphasis shifted to some extent in this Exploring Minds programme. The emphasis shifted from instruction education rather than from pure information. In 1953-54 I think there were approximately 25 programmes. The University of Montreal helped to prepare 6, McGill was responsible

for 3 and the University of Toronto 16. In 1955-56, the University of British Columbia took part in 6 programmes, Carleton College took part in 3, Manitoba 1, McGill 3, Queen's 1, Ottawa 3, Western 1, University of Toronto 26, and the C.B.C. had 6 programmes for which they were almost solely responsible. That is over the last two-year period. These programmes have been channeled, as far as the C.B.C. is concerned, through Talks and Public Affairs Department, and the programmes have gone across practically all the C.B.C. stations and most of the private ones.

Two things should be pointed out in connection with these programmes; one is that they have been national in character, and second is that they have been the responsibility of the Department of Talks and Public Affairs. That has had considerable to do with the choice of subject and the approach which C.B.C. has had to take concerning these programmes.

Now, I think we should refer back to the Massey Commission. According to the Massey Commission, two chief objectives of our national system of broadcasting our national unity and understanding and education in the broad sense. I think we can assume that the C.B.C. has taken those aims and objectives quite seriously, and their annual reports give ample evidence they have kept those aims in mind ever since the beginning of the programming, in fact ever since 1937, when the Talks and Public Affairs Department was formed, having I think considered themselves a kind of Department of University Extension, and they

have fulfilled that function quite adequately. The fact that the programmes have been national in scope rather complicated the task of both the University and the C.B.C. You will notice as I read the summary of the universities involved in these programmes, there have become more and more universities involved. Hence the programmes have often been formulated not in any sequence of programmes which would be important as educational programme, but rather because of matters of chance that universities or colleges happen to be in a particular position to offer a programme at one time. Therefore, there has been some lack of co-ordination in the presentation of these programmes.

Then, too, I think the criticism which we would make would be that the programmes were half-hour in nature. They dealt with a subject in a period of one-half hour, something which in our view, and in fact in the experiences of the American universities, is probably wrong. There is nothing wrong with a half-hour programme so long as there is a series of half-hour programmes covering one topic. Most of the topics covered require certainly more than half an hour to do justice to it.

Another important factor is the limited budget of the Department of Talks and Public Affairs. Responsibility has rested with them for the planning of this series, and they have been hampered I think in trying to produce men who had the know-how to do this kind of programme and who had the time and money available in order to do a complete job.

It is our feeling that educational television demands a very special kind of training. It is not suitable for a professor who has experience in presenting a lecture to undergraduates to take on a television production. Neither is it advisable or best to have a man who is experienced in producing another kind of programme over C.B.C. to do the same job. We feel that the combination of the professor-producer is the desirable type of person to be involved in this purely educational kind of programme.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do such men exist?

MR. COULTER: I hope so. I think they might be trained. I am not sure they exist at the moment. Now, Exploring Minds has been of an experimental nature.

In the end of the '54-'55 series in a programme for which the C.B.C. was solely responsible this statement was made:

"Good evening. This is the last broadcast
"in the current series of Exploring Minds.
"Today we would like to take a second look
"at a few of the programmes we have pre-
"sented since last October, and perhaps as
"we consider this year's work, we can ex-
"plore your thinking and our own on the
"series as a whole. Exploring Minds came
"to the air three years ago. It began as
"a co-operative experiment in programming
"between the University of Toronto and the
"C.B.C., Toronto station CBLT."

The speaker there was referring to the "Varsity Story".

In the very early stages marriages of this kind usually present difficulty, and Exploring Minds was no exception. Both partners found themselves asking such questions, "What will the menu be? How much seasoning will the broth have? How much frosting shall we put on the cake, or does it need any at all?" Needless to say, these problems have been worked out amicably and successfully.

Progress has been made in radio with its old and established tradition, and in television, whose tradition is being hammered out day by day as new programmes and new techniques are tried.

Now, this view is entirely too sanguine. Throughout '55-'56 some questions have been asked by the two partners, and although there has been progress, it is not true to say the problems have been worked out successfully. The evidence is in the programmes themselves; adequate, sometimes good, occasionally confused, but never first-class, and this after four years, the situation is not likely to improve until an educator trained in television is put in charge of the programme. The amateurs, whether they be in the university or in the television studios, have not been able in four years to answer the question, "What will the menu be, how much seasoning will the broth have?" Time for experimenting is past and time to call in a professional.

Now, Exploring Minds type of series is not actually sufficient to allow Canadian universities to make their proper contribution to this field. There

are two possibilities that exist. I think one is to allow, or to bring about the situation in which the Canadian universities have their own television stations. The other is for co-operation to continue between the Canadian universities and the C.B.C. in the hope that this marriage, which has perhaps not been too successful so far, could continue on a better basis.

If we look at the United States picture, we find there are approximately 20 educational stations in the United States, and I think 12 of them are university stations. Their system is different from ours. They have no C.B.C. as we conceive it and therefore it is perhaps necessary for the Americans to follow this kind of arrangement, but in addition to that practically all American universities have their Department of Speech so that as they produce television programmes they can also be training personnel in speech, in radio, in television. The Canadian universities do not and have not up to the present considered that to be one of their functions, and hence it is perhaps not as desirable for Canadian universities to set up their own television stations as it is for the Americans to do so. The matter of expense comes into the picture. Recently we visited the University of Michigan, and Michigan State. We found at Michigan State where they have a complete set-up including a transmitter, their capital cost was approximately \$600,000, and they operate on a budget of about \$300,000 per year. At the University of Michigan where they have no transmitter but where they produce kinescopes, their

capital expenditure is approximately \$300,000 and operating expense amounts to \$150,000. I think this situation of universities having their own television station is perhaps impossible except for some of the very largest universities in the country. We feel that it is more desirable to have money that is collected channelled directly to the C.B.C. and that the C.B.C. and the university go on co-operating and putting on the type of programme for which the university, or in which the university can make a maximum contribution.

Now, the university has a State obligation. Particularly those universities which are State universities. The C.B.C. of course has a State obligation, and it seems to me it would be rather uneconomical for money to be collected from two sources for the same purpose, and programmes of a similar nature be put on then by the university and by the C.B.C.

The next point we wish to make is the matter of time. I referred before to the fact that it is almost impossible to treat an educational subject successfully in one half-hour. Now, the American universities again have found that one can treat a subject successfully in 15 or 20 or 25 half-hour programmes. In other words, the sequence of idea is presented through a large number of programmes, but it is impossible to do justice to any subject at the university level in one half-hour. The advantage of the type of arrangement which we suggest is that programmes could be put on a national or on a local level, that kinescopes could be made of such programmes,

kinescopes could be passed then from one section of the country to another or from one season to another and be made available to the public for the whole of the year.

All these arrangements we realize would cost money, and I think it is only fair to point out that more money should be available to the Talks Department and Public Affairs Department for this purpose. More manpower would be available. Perhaps each C.B.C. station across the country would have to have this professor-producer individual of which I have spoken, and more manpower and more time would need to be available for the production of such programmes. That is our thinking on this matter, and I would like to read the final formal recommendation which we have made to the Commission.

The University of Toronto therefore respectfully recommends that the Royal Commission on Broadcasting give consideration to -

(1) The desirability of placing the C.B.C.'s Department of Talks and Public Affairs in a financial position which enables it (a) to assign qualified persons to supervise such educational programmes as "Exploring Minds", and (b) to assist the Canadian universities in the production of such other television programmes as in the future they find it necessary or desirable to prepare.

(2) The allocation of a certain number of hours in the weekly schedule of each C.B.C.

or private television station for the adult education work conducted by the university or universities of its area.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Coulter. Do you wish to add anything at this stage, Dr. Harris?

DR. HARRIS: No, I am waiting for questions.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Coulter, can you just tell us a little more about the University Television Committee? Is it a committee of the senate of the University or is it a standing committee?

MR. COULTER: The Committee is a presidential committee, appointed by the President, and it consists of members of various faculties and departments in the University.

MR. COYNE: Is it a standing committee?

MR. COULTER: Yes, it is.

MR. COYNE: Turning to the section of your brief where you are describing the development of Exploring Minds as a national programme on page 5, you say:

"Attempt to make Exploring Minds a national
"programme has however greatly complicated
"the task of producing sound educational
"programmes. If national coverage is
"important, it is obviously desirable to
"include as many universities as possible."

I wonder if you could explain a little on why it is obviously desirable to include as many universities as possible just because a programme is directed to a national audience?

MR. COULTER: I think the answer to that, each university has its distinctive contribution to make. Apart altogether from such matters as jealousy, one university can do one thing superbly and one university can merely do it well. You might as well have the superb presentation being made by one university rather than another.

Then, too, I think it is a practical expedient that people from British Columbia, for example, would expect U.B.C. to do a programme just as much as people from Toronto would expect the University of Toronto to do a programme. I do not say that the University of Western Ontario could not do a series of programmes which would be palatable for the whole of the Dominion, I am only saying that it is desirable for each university to do its own contribution.

MR. COYNE: Is this something like forming a Federal Cabinet? You have to have regional representation regardless of individual capabilities? I can see it may happen in practice, but why is it desirable that every university should have a crack at it, if some universities can do a job superbly and others are not equipped to do it as well?

DR. HARRIS: I believe the desirability is in the eyes of the C.B.C. The C.B.C. feels it is presenting a national programme. It feels an obligation to have representation from various parts of the country such as in planning the programming of 25, it feels there should be so many from there and from there and there. It doesn't feel free to say, "Well,

the university or universities which can best do these 25 programmes we have in mind happen to be these two." We must include representation from right across the country. This is not our view. This is the C.B.C. view, or our interpretation of the C.B.C. view.

MR. COYNE: Do you feel it is desirable that this should be the criterion, if you like?

MR. COULTER: I don't. I feel that the only criteria for the production of national television programmes is quality. The subject is all-important.

MR. COYNE: I suppose if there was some programme that had some regional origin or where they did have a regional feature, even though going over a national network, perhaps there might be some virtue in having the local university do it if they were able to do so?

MR. COULTER: I think it is a case where the local university would be best able to present this particular programme.

MR. COYNE: I take it from what you say as far as you are concerned, the standard of criterion is always quality, and the university that is best equipped to produce the programme should produce it, whether it is in Halifax, Toronto or Vancouver?

In connection with the disadvantage that you spoke of, of attempting to develop an idea within a half-hour limitation which that imposes, I take it what you have in mind as an alternative is not individual very long programmes of, say, two hours in length, but more a series of programmes developing a particular

subject or idea, is that correct?

MR. COULTER: That is entirely correct. The point is, wherever adult education is undertaken, if you take a university extension course or the reading of a book, much more time is involved than half an hour. No one expects very much out of half an hour. Any subject that is worth dealing with requires very thorough treatment, and it is impossible for television with all its advantages to deal with a complex subject in a half-hour. It can deal very adequately with the subject if it has perhaps six or eight or ten or twenty successive half-hour programmes, but if you look at this in terms of the audience or the viewer, what is going to happen to him in the sequence of programmes is something I think quite definite, whereas what happens to him in half an hour is sort of like an opening of the eyes but no follow-up. Education is something you can't pick up in half an hour.

THE CHAIRMAN: How often have these Exploring Minds been on in the past -- take the past year? Once a week?

MR. COULTER: The schedule has always been one programme a week for the winter season from October through to March.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, this point of the desirability of a connection between succeeding programmes, it seems a pretty obvious one. Why hasn't it been done up to now?

MR. COULTER: Well, it has not been done. This is really a question which perhaps the C.B.C.

Talks and Public Affairs Department could answer more accurately than I can. I can only report on the difficulties that we have experienced in trying to persuade the C.B.C. to put on a sequence of five inter-related programmes and for a variety of reasons have found it impossible to do this. For example, they feel there must be if we have five programmes from Toronto, that this should be devoted to a series of different subjects. With all different kinds of viewers, they should be all catered to. That has been the experience in the past. And then, if a subject required a treatment of, let us say, eight, this would be impossible under the present arrangements because the C.B.C. would not feel free to put on eight in succession from one centre. They wouldn't feel it necessary for timetable reasons to distribute this throughout the country.

THE CHAIRMAN: It stays basically within the principle of trying to get a variety to the viewers so that they do not concentrate too much on any one subject?

DR. HARRIS: There is this basic conflict: To use 26 hours to throw light on twelve or twenty-four subjects as distinct from taking one subject and doing it really well.

MR. COULTER: I think there is another point that should be mentioned here. It is a slightly different point, but it has relevance on the subject. We do not feel it is necessary in every case to produce a programme which is national in coverage. We think that universities should be able to produce

from time to time programmes which are particularly applicable to their own community. This year the sub-committee of our Television Committee went to considerable trouble to have outlined a programme on Toronto, the development or growth of the city, and in our minds, of course, this programme was being planned for metropolitan Toronto primarily. When we took the idea to the C.B.C., it was pointed out that the Talks Department was responsible to the whole of the country, and it should produce programmes which would be relevant right across Canada.

They pointed out that this programme would be also too expensive to produce just for metropolitan Toronto community, and therefore, you have two ideas. You have programmes which can be produced for a community and pertaining to that community. You have other programmes which are desirable for the whole country.

MR. COYNE: Have you ever looked into the question of having these programmes sponsored?

MR. COULTER: Well, as university policy, we have not been too interested in sponsored programmes up to the present time. I personally have had no experience.

DR. HARRIS: The matter has been discussed in the Television Committee on one or two occasions, but has unfortunately always remained on the agenda. We have not gone out in the field to find out if sponsorship is possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have no objection to sponsorship?

DR. HARRIS: Well, as an individual member of the Committee, I am not too sure if I can speak for the university as a whole. I personally can see no reason why sponsorship is impossible.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Where are programmes produced, in the C.B.C. studios?

DR. HARRIS: First year "Varsity Story" they used a mobile unit and cameras came to this campus. That is one reason why the programmes that year were descriptive rather than provocative, but since the last three years programmes have always been studio-produced.

MR. COYNE: Well, the efficacy of the professor-producer -- which is an interesting phrase -- do you contemplate that this qualified professor-producer would be an employee of the C.B.C. or of the universities?

MR. COULTER: I think if the final responsibility for the production of the programme rests with the C.B.C., he probably should be an employee of the C.B.C. I am not sure that we are being fair in putting professor-producer in that order. Perhaps it should be producer-professor, but we are convinced the combination of the two is most desirable.

MR. COYNE: If through development of the medium television becomes a useful and successful tool of university extension work, do you feel that the university should make some sort of financial contribution or undertake to incur certain parts of the costs of projecting these programmes which are performing a university function?

MR. COULTER: No, I do not. I realize I cannot substantiate my argument too forcefully. What I pointed out in the brief was that it is uneconomical for a university to set up a whole television station when facilities already exist. My other point would be since funds are collected from the public for the running of the university, and since the public funds are collected for C.B.C. purposes, that there is no reason why it should be channeled from the public to the university to the C.B.C.; that the line might be direct rather than triangular.

MR. COYNE: Except that it is possible there may be different publics from whom the funds are being collected?

MR. COULTER: It is possible.

MR. COYNE: My point would be this: If the University Extension Department has a budget and spends money on the development of adult education, using various additional media if you like, why should it not also be asked to contribute something out of its budget to the use of this new media? I am thinking more in terms, for example, you gave the metropolitan series as being too expensive to fit into the C.B.C. budget.

MR. COULTER: I don't think I have any arguments, strong argument, in this direction. I think I can only state that the university is busy collecting money for other purposes, and this would impose another burden on the university as such. I think it is a burden that should be imposed on someone, and

of course it eventually comes down to the general public.

I just don't think it is necessary or expedient to have the university collect the money, and then turn it over to the C.B.C., when it is coming from the public in the long run, but I would say I have no strong counter-argument to your proposal.

DR. HARRIS: It seems to me that the university's contribution is most likely to arise in a sense in providing the professor's time. You must obviously pay a person if he is going to devote a good deal of time, and it may be equivalent to teaching a three hours a week course, and I think that is the line where the university is most likely to feel it could fill financial responsibility, but I think what the university is against is the idea of paying \$3,000 to the local C.B.C. station for the production of a programme. It is all public money.

MR. COYNE: But there might be no reason why a professor-producer could not as well be either an employee, or partially or wholly paid as a member of the University Extension Department rather than as a member of the C.B.C., is there?

MR. COULTER: No, I think that is quite possible.

MR. COYNE: I notice on page 8 where you draw a certain distinction between the situation in the United States and Canada, particularly with regard to the training of personnel, and you say at the bottom:

"Furthermore, most Canadian universities

"would argue strongly that the training of

"television producers and engineers is not
"their function."

But what about the training of professor-producers, or people who are in fact going to develop the medium of television as an arm of university extension work?

MR. COULTER: If that question is directed to me, I would say it is hard to draw a line. We are merely stating a fact here that universities would argue strongly that the training of television producers and engineers is not their function. Just where you would draw the line is a matter of individual opinion. I can see that a university might take it on as one of their functions to produce or train this professor-producer. I think that is a difficult thing to answer.

MR. COYNE: Would you care to say why the Canadian universities take a different attitude from the American ones in this matter of vocational training?

MR. COULTER: It is merely a matter of educational philosophy that Canadian universities have been more concerned with the traditional approach to higher education in that it trains a man to be a man rather than train a man to be a technician or a skilled operator. Again, you can find plenty of examples to the contrary, but I think in a philosophical concept that the difference between the Canadian universities and the American universities, the American universities have been drawn further in one direction than the Canadian universities have, and this is again a matter of fact. This is not a desirable or an undesirable situation.

DR. HARRIS: It is also a matter of history. The speech departments in the United States broke off from the English departments in the 1890s and they obtained a status, a quite independent status. When radio came in, first of all they took over from journalism, and in a sense they developed into a journalism school. In the 1920s with radio, radio became a speech department, and then there was the training of radio personnel. And now in the 1940s and 1950s, the training of television personnel. Hence you get this practical argument that there is a function to perform in training, but we never had speech departments in Canada for a number of reasons, and hence these other departments have never emerged.

MR. COYNE: Can you tell us how the University of Michigan, which you pointed out has no transmitter, produced television on films? How did they arrange for screening of their programmes?

DR. HARRIS: They have their own station complete, minus the transmitter. They have their own studio, and own complete equipment, and they have produced programmes in their own studios with what material they have available, and usually kinescope is made at the institution, and the kinescope then is sent to various outlets, different stations with transmitters in different parts of the country.

MR. COYNE: That is the different stations must request that the kinescopes be sent to them?

MR. COULTER: And pay for it.

DR. HARRIS: But on a cost basis. The

University of Michigan has \$150,000 budget for annual expenditures, but they receive in effect nothing back. In other words, it is not a cost basis. They simply supply it at cost and the university assumes the expense.

MR. COYNE: But they have no assured outlets at all? It is just a matter of letting the various stations know they have the programmes available and waiting for a request to send the kinescopes out?

MR. COULTER: There is another important body in Ann Arbor, Michigan, an educational television centre, and this centre is a co-ordinating body set up by the Ford Foundation money, and it is their function to set up the best programmes that are being produced by any of the American universities, and then to distribute these programmes to the various centres. That is another organization which they have and which we do not have at the moment.

MR. COYNE: These programmes, are they screened on ordinary commercial stations, do you know? Are they limited to the few educational or university stations?

DR. HARRIS: For example, I would say every programme produced by the University of Michigan is screened at Ann Arbor, which is a commercial station, and I would say they take everything, but the station at Michigan is in a very happy position of having far more requests than they can fill. When we were down there they had programmes from something like 25 different stations all across the country and orders for submissions over a six-month period.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do these private stations in the United States, they do pay something?

DR. HARRIS: Yes, they pay a basic fee which really covers the cost of shipping and probably a percentage of the cost of the kinescope itself. But it is quite a nominal sum. It is not something which breaks the local station's budget. It is really quite cheap.

THE CHAIRMAN: But the private stations in the United States appear to be willing and even anxious to take this type of programme?

DR. HARRIS: I would say that is a fair statement.

MR. COYNE: Turning then to the alternative you suggest, that is the alternative to actually setting up university stations in this country, I take it what you have in mind is that the C.B.C. would require both its own and private stations in the different areas to carry a certain specified amount of media called adult education programming, is that correct?

MR. COULTER: Yes.

MR. COYNE: And do you contemplate that for example the C.B.C. would simply turn over time to the universities who would be responsible themselves for developing programmes, or is it rather a matter of the C.B.C. in their own schedule allocating so much time for educational programmes which they will then work out in co-operation with the universities?

MR. COULTER: I think the latter is more accurate since the universities have not got studios.

Obviously the C.B.C. would have to devote time and energy and facilities to this project. It would be merely a co-operative effort to enable programmes which the university can do perhaps better than anybody else to be a partner in such programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: On that point of co-operative effort, assuming that the C.B.C. would be involved as one of the major partners in the effort, and also assuming for the moment at least the idea that there should be a number of universities involved in it is a correct one, is there any machinery for bringing together the kind of activity that your Television Committee does at the University of Toronto with the similar activities in Alberta and British Columbia and Halifax? I mean, is there in existence any national tie-up at the university level in this field?

MR. COULTER: No, there is not at the moment, and I think mainly because of the relatively small amount of participation of the universities. I think if universities were assured of more participation, that kind of organization would emerge quite obviously and naturally.

THE CHAIRMAN: May this not be the real explanation of the sort of hit-and-miss nature of the programming?

MR. COULTER: I don't think so, Mr. Chairman. It could be a reason, but I do not think it is the main reason.

DR. HARRIS: May I add I feel it is a real responsibility for the universities here. I think

if the time is made available to the universities for the work on adult education, and the C.B.C. has in a sense fulfilled its function, if the university refuses to take up the opportunity, that is where the matter drops. But it seems to me each university that wishes to pursue its work in adult education work for the community of which it is a part, it should have this opportunity. If it decides for any of a dozen reasons not to do so, all right, but the opportunity should be there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Aren't you getting the cart before the horse? How can an operating body say next month or six months from now we are going to make time available without knowing that one would be taken up for any one of these half-dozen good reasons you mentioned? Surely the step must come the other way. Isn't the way for this to be done for the universities to develop that project and propose a scheme for getting its objectives across, and if you like, selling it to the C.B.C.? Why do you say the C.B.C. has to start out by making time available, and if you choose to take it up, okay.

MR. COULTER: I think the fact we are here is ample evidence of the fact this university is ready and willing to do it. We think we can do it. I think that fact indicates that this university, and I am quite sure other universities, are prepared to do that. Now obviously, there would be planning between the university and the C.B.C. before the C.B.C. set aside a block of time for such programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think you would have to do it that way.

MR. COULTER: Yes.

DR. HARRIS: It is also safe to say it takes six months to plan a proper programme, so you are working on a six-month or twelve-month proposition, so I don't see the difficulty.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am just raising the question with you as to whether or not the first step in formulating the proposal, and I don't mean just a Toronto story such as you mentioned, but a broad proposal in the field of this adult education, whether the responsibility for that, the first step, doesn't really rest with the university but presumably the universities, who know more about the field of adult education than anyone, I am not saying that it is all new, it is just beginning to get started, but it is a good idea to know whose responsibility the initiation is. And I am raising with you the question of whether the universities are not the ones who should be doing the initiating.

MR. COULTER: I agree.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Collateral to that, you might get the universities together, and then you could arrange programmes throughout the season that all run in sequence rather than the sporadic business that you operate now. I understood from Mr. Coulter at the start that there was no continuation of programmes. One university would come on one week with a subject followed by a different subject the following week. If you initiated Mr. Coulter's suggestion you could

then also arrange that the programmes would follow in sequence.

MR. COULTER: I don't think, Mr. Stewart, it works out quite that way. In other words, you do not conceive a series and have each university fit into the series.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Don't you think it is a possibility?

MR. COULTER: Not a good one. I think it is a better possibility to have one university conceive a series and one university then follow through with that series. Another university conceives another series and it follows through with that. I think that for the interests of best quality programmes that is a better way of planning it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then it would depend on the nature of the programmes?

MR. COULTER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You could conceive a certain kind, let us say an adult education history programme, where you would want to have diversity of participation of different universities?

MR. COULTER: Oh yes, there are all kinds of degrees.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: To make one point clear, who so far has been carrying on the financial burden of producing such programmes as "Varsity Story" and "Exploring Minds"?

MR. COULTER: The C.B.C.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Both or on shares?

MR. COULTER: No, entirely.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: The university provides knowledge and professional ability to produce the programme?

MR. COULTER: Except in the matter of time actually it has been the C.B.C.'s responsibility. If you include the professor's knowledge and time then you can say the university has made a sizeable contribution.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: But it is given free by the university? It is entirely free?

DR. HARRIS: In the interests of accuracy, the C.B.C. has paid the professor a salary.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: What I had in mind, I was wondering -- you referred a moment ago to such programmes as the history of Toronto, and the C.B.C. said that was too much of a local character to be carried nationally. I believe in Toronto you have here several T.V. stations, Barrie, Kitchener and Hamilton -- have you ever thought of getting to those stations with the thought of producing a programme of local interest?

MR. COULTER: We have not done that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sure Hamilton would produce the history of Toronto!

DR. HARRIS: What struck us was, for instance, metropolitan Toronto area, and we were actually thinking of really including Hamilton, Oshawa and the Niagara Peninsula area within the range of the Toronto station here. A 40-mile circle. About 2 million people.

THE CHAIRMAN: Supposing instead of just

the history of Toronto you are going to have a history of Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver and Halifax and Quebec City, a continuous series, such as you mentioned, then the history may become a valid part of national programming.

MR. COULTER: I think that is true. This was a programme conceived by us for this purpose. We had no idea of trying to sell it to the C.B.C. on a national basis. It was our ignorance, perhaps, that led us into thinking this could be produced over CBLT for Toronto and district and Niagara Peninsula area. The circle of 40 or 50-mile radius, but the thing you suggest could be done.

THE CHAIRMAN: As a valid national programme of adult education?

MR. COULTER: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Just to finish that up, the principle reason why the C.B.C. is not prepared to carry it over CBLT alone was because of the amount of cost which they considered could not be justified in their budget for purely a local production?

MR. COULTER: I think the principle reason, as stated to us, was the fact that Talks Department was responsible to the nation, that their prime purpose was to produce programmes for national coverage. The cost factor was secondary to that.

MR. COYNE: That is, it is not part of their function to produce local programmes of interest to particular localities?

MR. COULTER: I am not saying it is not

part, I am merely saying it was pointed out to us that their prime purpose was national coverage.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is true the C.B.C. operating stations such as in Toronto, I understand they do not take up the full broadcasting time with the so-called national programmes? Perhaps I shouldn't ask you that.

MR. COULTER: I think that is their argument.

DR. HARRIS: There is a little more question of the Talks Department had a certain limited number of hours in the week for production of its programmes, and its requirements at the national level were such that it was not able to use the time up for this local programme.

MR. COYNE: I have no more questions.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Have you any idea of the extent of the audience that you have on these adult education shows?

MR. COULTER: You mean on "Exploring Minds" programme that have been running?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes.

MR. COULTER: No, I don't think there is any accurate research has been done.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Because when we were in Alberta, the University of Alberta, they were talking radio entirely, told us they had a station which ultimately was taken over by the Provincial Government, they had been running it for quite a long time and they went into the field of music and arts of various kinds, but a survey indicated that they

were -- their audience was decreasing all the time except in the matter of music. I just wondered if you had any idea of the listening audience you had?

MR. COULTER: No, there are no statistics available. I think it should be pointed out that we consider that a listening audience of 5,000 might be just as valid as a listening audience of 5 million, but there are no statistics.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I see. Now, throughout your whole submission you have talked of television. Is there any particular reason why a study of this kind should come over television rather than radio?

MR. COULTER: No, I don't think so. I think we should have made more emphasis on radio. I think it is quite obvious that certain programmes with which the university could be involved would be more suitable to radio than television.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You don't think there is any particular need to put this over television rather than radio? One would be as effective as the other?

MR. COULTER: No, I think it is perhaps more accurate to say television is more suitable as a medium for certain kinds of programmes than radio is. Radio is more suitable for other types of programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: In a case where you want visual as well as audio, you use television, and if it can be done without distraction by ear alone you do it, is that right?

MR. COULTER: I think so.

THE CHAIRMAN: You talked in your recommendations of the desirability of placing Talks and Public Affairs Department of the C.B.C. in a financial position which enables it to assign qualified persons to supervise and so on, and to assist Canadian universities in the production of such television programmes. This might be as precise as you are able to be, but from our point of view as a Commission, we have to look at finances and costs which are mounting in this field and we have to have some idea what kind of cost you are talking about. Just to say, "to be put in a financial position which enables it to do something", does not convey any order or magnitude to me. Let us take "Exploring Minds" for the record, if for no other reason, is that an expensive programme? Is it a panel discussion type of programme? Is it a heavy thing to produce or relatively light?

MR. COULTER: Again I think you have us at some disadvantage since costs are a matter for the C.B.C. to answer. They are experts in determining costs, but I would say the kind of programme that we would be interested in would be a reasonably expensive programme. That is to say, probably film would be used, film clips of certain dramatizations might involve hiring of actors to do parts of the programme, so I would say to some extent it might be costly. There are other programmes in which the professor did nine-tenths of the work which would be reasonably inexpensive.

THE CHAIRMAN: Like a panel discussion type of thing?

MR. COULTER: Yes. I think they would vary all the way from quite/^{an}inexpensive programme to a fairly expensive one. I gather from talking to the C.B.C., however, they could range anywhere from \$1,000 to \$4,000 per half-hour programme, but that is not accurate, that is only on the basis of what I have heard from the C.B.C.

DR. HARRIS: That has been the range.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the range? \$1,000 to \$4,000 for half-hour programmes? You see, it is very helpful to get the suggestion that this is a thing that you feel is necessary, but when we ultimately have to work out suggestions for a C.B.C. budget, you must know what kind of thing you put in for this type of thing, and your suggestion does leave us without any assistance on that front. I am not blaming you because it may be impossible, but if there is any way you can give us any order or magnitude of what this added cost would be to provide the sort of programme you envisage, we would be glad to have it. Perhaps not now but later on if your Committee is able to work anything out.

MR. COULTER: I think your question is certainly justifiable. At the moment we can't give you the information, but we will try to provide it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have your Committee come, and also any comments you might make on this suggestion I made a moment ago of the desirability of some

tie-up between the universities themselves and the formulation or initiation by them, I would be interested in any of your views.

I have only one other question, and that is going away from educational television for a moment on to the general question of programming. I was struck -- the way you people have been studying, interested and perhaps expert people, for some time -- I was struck by your phrase that television through ease of the approach encourages pacivity of mind. Any expansion of that I would be interested in it, and also as to whether this comment which perhaps should be had in mind when you are going into the whole question of programming in television. Is there a tendency because of pacivity of mind, a tendency to have an effect on the programme?

MR. COULTER: There again it is difficult to draw lines. In the best programmes I don't think there is any pacivity of mind, but I think there is the tendency for a man perhaps to sit back in his easy chair in the living-room and relax to the extent in which there may be pacivity of mind. Such a tendency does not exist so easily in the classroom, in the more formal environment of the university classrooms. I think it is a factor that should be kept in mind and programmes should be so organized and so produced that this tendency towards pacivity of mind is not allowable.

THE CHAIRMAN: You said a moment ago the best programmes do not contribute to this pacivity

of mind, but before you get to the actual programme being on, maybe this element of pacivity of mind would have something to do with the choice of the programme?

MR. COULTER: I think possibly so, yes.

DR. HARRIS: In all the programmes that we have been responsible for at all we have insisted and the C.B.C. has quite agreed that it must be something that could not be fully well done on radio. Hence with one exception we have had no panel discussions because we feel a panel discussion which is the interplay of ideas from one person to another is something which can best be done on radio, but there are distractions. Pacivity of mind here operates because an audience gets fascinated by a mole on somebody's nose. What is important in a panel discussion is what the person is saying, and it is better to have a blank and hence we have had no panel discussion. We have always tried to work out programmes which were a challenge and which raised a question, but if you have no programme following it, there is not much point in raising the question because you leave the audience up in the air. Come back another week and say, "All right, here is the answer".

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you both very much. This has been an interesting brief, and we will consider it.

MR. COULTER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

SUBMISSION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF FRENCH,
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

APPEARANCES:

Prof. C.D. Rouillard.

Prof. W.H. Trethewey.

Father L.J. Bondy.

Prof. E.A. Joliat.

Prof. R.W. Jeanes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we are to hear is one from the Department of French in the University of Toronto. I understand that that is to be presented by Prof. C.D. Rouillard, Prof. Trethewey, Father L.J. Bondy, Prof. E.A. Joliat, and Prof. R.W. Jeanes. I did not read all the various colleges you gentlemen come from. We will begin, if we may, while you are taking your seats, by marking this Exhibit 99.

EXHIBIT NO. 99: Brief of the Department of French in the University of Toronto.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is Prof. Rouillard going to present the brief?

MR. ROUILLARD: Yes, sir. I am beginning by explaining, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of French in the University of Toronto that is presenting this brief is really composed of four departments of French in each of the various colleges. We collaborate for purposes of curriculum and examinations and other such common causes as this. Prof. Trethewey is chairman this year of that combined French Department. Father Bondy is head of the Department of

French at St. Michael's College. Mr. Joliat, University College, and Prof. Jeanes, Victoria College. We are all members of the committee that worked on the brief. We are sorry that other members of the committee are absent in Europe.

We begin, Mr. Chairman, with a round of applause for the C.B.C. for the statement made by Mr. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the C.B.C. Board of Governors, as we saw it in the C.B.C. "Time" for March 11-17. Mr. Dunton stated, "In addition to the English-language networks, French-language service of the C.B.C. covers a major part of the country right from New Brunswick to parts of Saskatchewan and Alberta." I can't help noticing that this chain of French-language service right across the country just cuts across the head of Ontario and leaves a small deposit in Timmins and Sudbury, but a large part of Ontario, including the great City of Toronto, does not enjoy the privileges of sharing that service. An area that is far from minor in terms of population, and which constitutes one of the most vital and increasingly cosmopolitan centres of Canadian culture and commerce, is almost totally deprived of the opportunity to hear French spoken on radio or television.

We then proceed with some estimate of the size of the group that would be prepared to welcome and profit from French-language programmes. It is estimated, that of approximately 125,000 pupils studying French in the secondary schools of the Province, there are some 20,000 enrolled in French

classes at the present time in the secondary schools of Greater Toronto. Of these, roughly 2,000 will graduate this year from Grade 13 having completed five years of French, and another 1,000 will be going out into the community from Grade 12 after four years of French. There are nearly 2,000 students pursuing French studies in the University of Toronto, its federated colleges, and the evening tutorial classes conducted by the University Department of Extension. These figures are somewhat higher than those of twenty or thirty years ago, but it is expected they will be doubled in ten years. When such figures are projected over past and future years, they obviously represent a very considerable number of English-speaking Canadians who should be encouraged in every feasible way to maintain the skill acquired in their study of French in school and university.

That is not intended, Mr. Chairman, to say we think simply they should be encouraged, but we feel a great many of them are eager to have the opportunity which will encourage them to maintain their skills. The present situation, may I underline these words, represents, it seems to us, a shocking and unnecessary waste in a great investment in linguistic training.

Schools really have in the last decade particularly made great strides in teaching. We can testify to that in the university on the basis of new students who enter in the first year who are now much more able to understand and speak simple French

than they were some years ago. We endeavour, of course, to continue that work in the university.

The next page, on page 2 of our brief, we have tried to outline some of our efforts to make French a living language for our students, giving our lectures in French, many of them making conversation classes, and training in phonetics and pronunciation an integral part of our programme, provide speech laboratories where students may listen to spoken French on records, and record their own spoken French for criticism and guidance by experts. Outside the classroom we encourage participation in French plays, attendance at French clubs within the university and at non-university organizations also. We might have mentioned a number of others besides the three we mentioned. We might have spoken of France Canada, which would welcome more student participation. Certainly we might have mentioned Alliance Canadienne, with its very specific aims of encouraging closer relations between Ontario and Quebec. We could well mention Caravan weekend which brings students from Montreal and Toronto in very close and strenuous and joyous contact for a couple of weekends every year. They had something on a small scale at the Visite Provinciale for younger children. The ones we picked on to mention in the brief are Alliance Francaise, French Cine-Club, Les Treteaux de Paris. Those are three which present French lectures and films and plays which students are most apt to profit by. They are all worthwhile, but at best they are

intermittent and would represent less than 25 hours a year even if a zealous student were able to take advantage of them all.

At the same time we are sadly aware that every day from early morn to midnight the airwaves are full of spoken French we cannot hear.

At this point in the brief we admit freely that the C.B.C. is not entirely to blame for this situation. No doubt we ourselves as educators have been at fault for having expressed only sporadic and individual regret that the C.B.C. has not yet added this French auxiliary to our teaching of the French language. Assuming that the C.B.C. has simply been unwilling to institute such action without having greater evidence of a real demand, we welcome this opportunity of placing our case before the Royal Commission on Broadcasting. We are convinced that the teaching of French in this area in schools and universities would benefit enormously if students were able to hear French spoken, no longer at rare stated intervals, no longer only in an academic context, but as a living language in all the variety of C.B.C. offerings.

We pass on then to much broader considerations that transcend the academic. We do find constant evidence in the population at large of a continuing desire to communicate with French-speaking Canadians in their own language. Some of these people are ordinary citizens who may not often have that opportunity. Others are leaders in our society who come in contact with their fellow French-speaking

Canadians in business or national organizations, and find their old school French too rusty and overgrown to be of any practical use. They are mortified at the myth of bilingualism and frustrated by their own linguistic incapacity. Often the frustration is deepened by having short periods of fruitful practice and speaking French in Quebec or in France rendered abortive by return to a starvation diet and eventual death from inanition.

I cannot overstress the importance of this point in our minds. I can recall vividly, for example, the mixture of wistfulness and anguish and despair with which the late Harry Cassidy, director of the School of Social Work, used to speak of linguistic problems he experienced in many meetings that brought together representatives of Ontario and Quebec, and we can all multiply an example of that kind many times.

Some, of course, do take drastic measures to remedy the situation. I am thinking of one of our most celebrated doctors who had this year attended undergraduate conversation classes in French and made time for that in order to brush up his French. But most men and women cannot find the time for such remedies, and we submit it should not be necessary if they could keep their French polished up.

Oftentimes we know the blame for this very common experience of linguistic helplessness is laid squarely upon the schools as if the schools should have endowed us with some miraculous gift of tongue which would remain nimble without exercise. I hope

we are not giving the impression that fluency in speaking French could be acquired or even maintained merely by listening to the spoken French on the air, but we do believe daily practice in listening even to French in weather bulletins or news reports or sportscasts or introductions to musical programmes would go very far toward keeping alive acquired skills, also inspire confidence, broaden vocabularies and stimulate further linguistic progress. Many students already possess or gradually acquire ability to enjoy panel discussions, dramatic programmes and the like. Here we might have cited a great many other French network examples. Among them there is the Conference du Presse from 7.00 to 7.30, or such special events as the recent broadcasting of all of the recorded plays that were given so successfully last fall by the Comedie Francaise. Plays by Moliere and others. We might have mentioned Radio College and its very distinct offerings.

You, sir, I know are familiar with Radio College. I fancy a great many people in Toronto are unaware of the existence of Radio College. They put on a very interesting programme every year, and if you glance over their booklet you see on Sunday afternoon and almost every evening there are a great variety of very rich and rewarding programmes on such things as art and music and things of broader interest for a wider portion of the population, such as a very fascinating series on the Canadian Indian. These are presented in the months of September, October,

November, and December in the fall, and then in the spring, there being a programme from the 8th January through to the 20th April. These programmes appeal greatly to us, Mr. Chairman. In fact, they are mouth-watering, and there are things which are again I say in the air which we cannot tap. There are other offerings such as readings, and with proper advance warning in the publication which is equivalent to the C.B.C. "Times", to which a discriminating public would certainly subscribe if the French network was broadcast in Toronto and in other parts of Ontario.

Listeners could provide themselves with the text in advance if they wanted to read and listen at the same time, or perhaps we might even conceive French clubs or informal conversation groups making certain programmes a nucleus for discussion. They're an infinite possibility along these lines.

We have talked so far, Mr. Chairman, mainly of English-speaking kinds. We are aware also that French-language programmes would have for many French-speaking Canadians living in our midst just as much or perhaps more interest. Such French-speaking Canadians are estimated as running to anywhere from 35,000 to 50,000 in Toronto. There are also increasing numbers of French nationals, perhaps 1,000 resident in Toronto area. We should have mentioned the presence of hundreds of Swiss and Belgians in Toronto as well, perhaps representing another 1,000, and there is a whole body of new Canadians, for many of whom French is a second language.

We are aware also of the interest that the French-language programmes would have for many people who are not peculiarly interested in language. A further enrichment of the already cultural services rendered by the C.B.C. locally. Our chief concern, however, remains the widespread need and desire of the English-speaking Canadians to maintain fruitful contact with our other national language.

We now come to the question, how can this best be achieved?

We are convinced that the situation calls for something more than a cautious prescription of one or two capsules of French to be added occasionally to the regular English bill of fare on the radio. We have considered suggesting that Toronto join in over CJBC on the midnight snack of French network programmes we understand Windsor enjoys. That would be better than nothing.

We are also mindful of the fact that such an insertion of a French programme on the regular English network would represent a displacement of a favourite programme of present listeners. We are aware of an active resentment as a result, we are told by our friends in the C.B.C., from the insertion of such French-language programmes into the English network. We feel that the experiment we are advocating would be far more satisfactory if there were an independent wavelength where French programmes could be heard at any time by others who wanted to tune in on them, without these programmes having to combat any

hostility as interlopers on the English network.

We are not naive enough, Mr. Chairman, to think this can be accomplished by a policy decision.

We go on to say we realize that the implementation of our proposal entails certain difficulties, not all of which may be clear to us. We believe that much of the French network is already coming through or into Toronto by wire. We believe that the expense of setting up and manning a repeater or relay station to re-broadcast French network programmes would not be prohibitive and would be quite legitimate as performing a vital public service.

The suggestion has been made that we might content ourselves with FM band. We don't feel frequency modulation broadcasting would reach enough people to justify the experiment. We know ourselves from a few people who own FM sets. We realize the standard broadcast band is crowded, the question of frequencies is a very serious one, but we would like to express our confidence that the C.B.C. could find a free wavelength as it can find money to use it if it is convinced of the desirability of doing so.

We therefore urge:

1. That a repeater station or other means be set up in Toronto to make at least the afternoon and evening French network programme of the C.B.C. available on the standard broadcast band to listeners in the metropolitan area;

2. That if this experiment meets with favour after a year's trial, it be repeated in other

centres such as Hamilton, Windsor, London and Kingston;

3. That eventually means be found to make this service available to all points in the Province of Ontario -- indeed in all Canada -- where there are schools and communities concerned with Canada's dual culture.

In so saying we are asserting our conviction in these communities which now have access only to the English half of our dual culture, a very real enrichment will come with acquaintance with another language as reflected through the French radio network.

Many of these same arguments are of course true for television. The last half-page of our brief deals with television. Perhaps we could have given television more importance than we did. We hope French network programmes will be available as freely as English television programmes, but we realize the problem is much more difficult.

We have noted with satisfaction the bilingual presentation on CBLT of "The Concert Hour" on Thursday at 10.00 o'clock where at least the introductory is in both languages. We hope this practice may be extended. We urge the experimental inclusion on CBLT of one or two popular weekly dramatic programmes such as "Le Survenant" or the French original "La Famille Plouffe". When we wrote this, this had meaning. We now have heard this group is coming off the air. Perhaps there will be some other French programme which would give meaning to our suggestion

that follows, where there would be a great linguistic interest in Ontario listeners to hear both English and French versions of the Plouffe family.

The next is also out-of-date. We say in the brief we note with interest the inception in Montreal of a French-language teaching programme on CBMT, Saturday, 1.30 and 2.30 P.M., entitled "Speaking French", and submit that such a programme is overdue in Toronto on CBLT.

We are very happy to see CBLT had some following and this programme is now being shown to the Toronto audience on Saturday afternoons at 1.45 for half an hour. This is an expert and entertaining programme under the direction of a professor of the University of Montreal. Of course, it is not enough. A similar 15-minute programme every day in the week may be more effective for any teaching. Perhaps we should be providing one ourselves, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps we could.

In any case, we predict a lively response from a wide cross-section of the English-speaking public which would be grateful for the contribution the C.B.C. is and will be in a position to make, along the lines we suggest, towards the breaking down of the linguistic barrier between French and English Canada, towards the encouragement of free inter-cultural exchange.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Rouillard. Do any of your associates wish to add anything at this time?

Mr. de Grandpre, have you any questions?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Professor, if I may, I will start with the last paragraph of your brief instead of starting at the first page. You say, "We predict a lively response from a wide cross-section of the English-speaking public." Now, before going further into your suggestions, do you know of any, or have you made any survey of the response which has been given in Montreal amongst the English-speaking population to this alternative programming which exists in Montreal?

MR. ROUILLARD: No, sir, I have not. I don't think any of us have.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you know of any surveys which have been made?

MR. ROUILLARD: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think, Mr. de Grandpre, that within the last couple of days I have heard of one, but whether this covers the precise point or not I am not sure.

MR. de GRANDPRE: There is this choice in Montreal for the English-speaking population, and I was just wondering whether surveys had been made to find out what was the percentage of the English-speaking population listening to the French-speaking programmes, which would have given us a gauge for the necessity of introducing such an alternate system.

MR. ROUILLARD: I am not sure that the figures would be completely accurate as parellels because the situation is very different in Montreal. On one hand, they have among other things, oppor-

tunities to hear French around them all the time without listening to the radio, and I find among a number of English-speaking people in Montreal there is perhaps almost a hostility towards the French language. Minority feeling, which leads them to avoid learning and speaking French and listening to it, but that is a personal reaction.

THE CHAIRMAN: I live in Montreal, but that is not universally true.

MR. ROUILLARD: No, I am not suggesting it is, but it might be a factor that should be taken into account, and although we have no figures we can, Mr. Chairman, point to the very extraordinary response to such an opportunity to see and hear French actors as we had this last fall when the Royal Alexandra was packed for five performances. I think it was a surprise and it was an eye-opener to many.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, along the same line of thinking, at page 2, you indicate you encourage participation in French plays, attendance at French clubs, at universities and at non-university organizations, and before that you had given some interesting figures as to the number of pupils graduating or about to graduate from the various schools.

Do you have any figures indicating the percentage of students attending these extracurricular activities? Is a mass of these students doing it, or is it the exception?

MR. ROUILLARD: If I were to answer the question in your own terms, I would say you have to

say it was the exception. At least there is a smaller proportion than we would hope would attend these organizations, lectures, or even French films. The students have seemingly a full life of campus activities, and we find they do not turn out to these organizations as often as we would hope. That, if taken by itself, would be a discouraging bit of evidence to answer that question quite truthfully. Perhaps some of my colleagues would like to speak to that as well. Perhaps they would not agree with my estimate.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I am just trying to go a little further than the brief goes. You led us to believe there is a great demand, and I am just wondering whether this demand is as great as it appears to be from your brief, and that is why I want you to go a little further and try and obtain some figures, if figures are available even on this score or any other score, which would give us something to work on.

You feel that relay stations should be installed in the Toronto area in order not to make breaks in the English broadcasting schedules, and give an opportunity to the listener?

It has been pointed out to us while we were in Winnipeg and Edmonton and Saskatoon that it is most difficult for English listeners to be familiar enough with the French language to follow a French programme produced in French and conceived in French for French listeners. Would you feel that the same remarks would apply here, or would you feel that the English listener in the Toronto area would be

quite apt to receive a French programme as it comes out from a French station?

MR. ROUILLARD: My answer to that would be that everything is relative. Of course, there would be a great number of people in Toronto who would find it difficult, particularly at first I think; on the other hand, there are a very considerable number of people who would very soon develop the ability to follow with very real enjoyment a great number of the programmes on the French network.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the case put in Winnipeg by the United College, the spokesman for United College, was that it was an impossible thing, so to speak, in producing French for English audiences. That is really your point?

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is right.

(Page 2377 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the case put in Winnipeg by the spokesman for the United College was that there was an importance, so to speak, in producing French for English audiences. This is really your point?

MR. deGRANDPRE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Rather than to merely make available to English audiences programmes produced for French speaking audiences?

PROFESSOR ROUILLARD: I think there is a great deal of truth in that, and it is perfectly possible that in the fare of the regular French network programme, there may be some programmes which would not be suitable for the rest - programmes of particular local interest, and we may well consider the insertion into the regular French programme of programmes made and produced in Toronto, let us say, with particular attention to English listeners.

MR. de GRANDPRE: What Professor Reid in Winnipeg had in mind was that a programme could be produced in French but would refer, for instance, to the history of Toronto or the history of Varsity, and give a special appeal to the English speaking audience and, without following the exact meaning of the words throughout the programme, they would know enough of the background of the programme to make it appealing to the English listener. You agree, I take it, that this would be the best possible approach to the French problem in Toronto, or the carrying of French programmes in Toronto?

PROFESSOR ROUILLARD: You mean our suggestion--

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you agree with Professor

Reid's suggestion that this would be the best possible approach to the problem?

PROFESSOR ROUILLARD: No sir, I would not agree thoroughly. I think it is one approach, but there is also a great deal to be said for a programme which is purely French, which French inspired, French produced and French presented.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You would not try to adapt a programme produced in Montreal to the Toronto atmosphere?

PROFESSOR ROUILLARD: No, ordinarily I should think not. If it wasn't proper for the Toronto audience we could substitute something else.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are making the point that in addition to the actual linguistic appeal there is an advantage also in getting the so called picture of French Canada into Toronto as a picture of French Canada.

PROFESSOR ROUILLARD: Exactly. One of the real by products of this proposal - perhaps more than a by product - is the linguistic means for a greater understanding of the province of Quebec or the French side of our culture through means of **the** French language.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has the added advantage that your proposal is cheaper than what an alternative would be.

PROFESSOR ROUILLARD: Yes. I would like to hear what some of my colleagues feel about this.

PROFESSOR JEANES: I would like to point out

that such intermediate programmes, or something like them, do exist in the service of the CBC international programmes. I have listened to these programmes when I can catch them, and I notice that although these programmes are destined for French listeners in other parts of the world they do make an effort to interpret all areas of Canada to the rest of the world, and I have found them most interesting and generally not too complicated. That type of thing could easily be switched on to the type of station we are talking about and I think it would be very useful. This programme already exists.

The second point is that so far we seem to be talking only about the problems of English speaking Canadians attempting to tune in on an unadulterated French programme. I think we should emphasize that there is a very large number of French speaking people in the Toronto area, and one of their problems is with their children, that the children are obviously absorbed by the surrounding English speaking atmosphere and one of the greatest problems is to make them realize that French is a language spoken by real people and that it is the only language that they speak, and to convince them that French culture is a real environment in which one may live exclusively. I have met a great number of children of French speaking parents

in the Toronto area, and the result is always the same: the children understand French but they refuse to reply in French. They reply in English simply because of this overwhelming pressure of the English language. This type of thing we are talking about would presumably help to restore the balance - not entirely, but it would certainly help, and such children certainly would be quite capable of understanding those programmes because they do have an ability to understand spoken French very well.

PROFESSOR JOLIAT: I think there is another angle that perhaps has not been fully covered, in this sense, that the educational system of Toronto and district, and perhaps Ontario in general would be most happy to have a French language programme going on all day long to which they could tune in at any time of the day as an adjunct to the teaching of French. There is already a programme done by one of our colleagues which comes on at specific times every week. The schools like it as far as it goes but they complain they cannot mobilize the students to listen at that hour and therefore it is as good as lost. If, for example, a particular school could allow a receiver to be on all day long as , for example, Professor Jeanes and myself would love to be able to do in our language laboratories and make it part of our daily

schedule to have students listening at any time they wanted to during the entire day to these programmes, it would be a very valuable adjunct to our teaching as well as to cultural pursuits.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but of course it is only fair to point out that to have a constant French programme going on the air all the time costs quite a lot of money, and the question really comes down to how much does it cost per actual listener. It may be quite a high figure, I don't know; it is hard to tell. You don't know how many listeners?

PROFESSOR JOLIAT: I understand there is already a station which is completely automatic which does the same for northern Ontario listeners.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: In the western provinces where there are four French language private stations, at least two of them pointed out to us that they were reaching a listening audience double their maximum potential. In other words, in the case of one particular station where it could have reached 50,000 French speaking persons in that particular areas their listening audience was about 100,000, which implies another group as large as the original group was listening most of the time, and I was wondering if this could apply also in this area? We will say in the case of Toronto there are about 50,000 French speaking people and some foreigners: would you expect to reach double the maximum listening audience most of the time? Would you

consider that fair, as is so in the west with at least two stations?

FATHER BONDY: I think it is an under statement.

PROFESSOR TRETHEWEY: Very definitely.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You would reach even more than double?

FATHER BONDY: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That was one question that I wanted to ask, because at one place in your brief I think on page 3, you say that there would be enormous benefits if students were able to hear - and that applies, "were able to hear" not only to students but others. The problem we are faced with is a conflict of testimony where many people argue that the cultural type programme put on by CBC is not listened to, it is not wanted, and this is the thing we have to weigh up and anything you can give us on the real extent of this desire, not only "would be able to hear" but would, in fact listen, would be very valuable. I can well see that in your activities you regard this and would regard this as a very desirable thing, but to what extent are you able to speak with knowledge that is really wanted by a substantial number of people?

PROFESSOR ROUILLARD: Mr. Chairman, we have very little evidence to go on because there has been such a small offering of radio or

television programming. We do feel, however, that we are constantly being given evidence of a great interest in things French in what is popularly known as an Anglo-Saxon City. I think a great many visitors to the city are astonished by evidences of this fact. One thing I may mention is that we have a thousand members in our French Cine Club. There are French language films without English sub-titles, and we have over one thousand members in the city.

THE CHAIRMAN: When the Comedy Franciase was here they filled the Royal Alexander Theatre?

PROFESSOR ROUILLARD: Yes.

PROFESSOR JOLIAT: It was impossible to get seats for two or three weeks before the performance.

THE CHAIRMAN: And that was a straight performance in French?

FATHER BONDY: No English at all.

PROFESSOR ROUILLARD: I think the manager estimated he could have sold out two or three more performances of the Bourgeois Gentilhomme.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Were they playing classics or modern?

PROFESSOR ROUILLARD: Classics.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Well, many students of French would be interested in the classical angle as part of their studies, but not in the modern things.

PROFESSOR ROUILLARD: There were not modern plays in this particular programme.

FATHER BONDY: I don't think we can say that everyone in the audience got everything; there were some who didn't follow it the way they would have in Paris, but they got a lot of it. It is not just what they get at the moment; it is the incentive they get to do more work, to be able to follow it up.

If I may return to a point that has some connection with this, I would take a very dim view of these French programmes so called tuned to the English speaking audience. When we give lectures in the University of Toronto in French, they can be given without any change in Montreal or Laval or perhaps the Sorbonne, and again, our students always get it almost as well as those for whom it is the mother tongue, they get a lot of it. I don't think the average intelligent audience would welcome that type of thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, you say you should not talk down to your audience?

FATHER BONDY: You should not talk down - under estimate them.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you have any idea of the area that a transmitter would have to cover in order to reach the 50,000 or 55,000 French speaking population in the - I don't know where

it is, and that is why I am asking the question - in this area? Would you have to beam this station with a very high power, or would a very limited power be sufficient to reach the greater proportion of the French speaking population in this area?

PROFESSOR ROUILLARD: I think Professor Jeanes can answer better than I can, but I think one of the local stations in Toronto now is a very low powered station and reaches all Metropolitan Toronto.

PROFESSOR JEANES: That is correct, I would say it would be a very low powered station indeed, something along the line of CHUM in Toronto which can be heard throughout the entire area, although it is quite impossible to get it if you go 30 miles away. Actually the transmitter itself is a very inexpensive item as far as I have been led to believe, at that power.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You would not have to go beyond the radius of 30 or 40 miles?

PROFESSOR JEANES: No.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is, in the immediate vicinity of Metropolitan Toronto you would reach a very substantial portion of the population referred to in the last paragraph on page 4 of your brief?

PROFESSOR JEANES: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: As a last question and perhaps it is an unfair question because you have

already indicated in your brief that you are not technicians, but with no technical knowledge do you have any idea of the cost that this would entail, or would that be a question which could be put to the CBC who would speak with more knowledge?

PROFESSOR ROUILLARD: We have made no attempt to estimate costs.

PROFESSOR JEANES: I would like to submit that I think it would be relatively inexpensive because, as I said a moment ago, the transmitter would certainly not be an expensive item. If it were operated automatically and fed with programmes which already exist, and which are at this very moment I am told by the CBC, available on the switchboard down town here, I don't see how it could be a terribly expensive arrangement. I am told that all one has to do, apparently, is plug in a wire and turn the switch and it is on the air.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you have the transmitter there and the wave length available?

PROFESSOR JEANES: That is right.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is all, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we thank you very much. It is for me an interesting thing to come to Toronto where I used to live and have this brief presented, particularly as ^{we} have had a number of briefs throughout Canada with this plea being put forward, but in most cases put forward by the French speaking community for a

French service. This one is one that is made primarily by an English speaking community for a French service. Thank you very much.

--- A short recess.

SUBMISSION OF THE NATIONAL PROGRESSIVE
CONSERVATIVE STUDENT FEDERATION

APPEARANCES:

Mr. Edward S. Rogers

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is to be presented by the National Progressive Conservative Student Federation, Mr. Edward S. Rogers, Chairman of the Broadcasting Committee, we will start by marking your brief as Exhibit No. 100.

EXHIBIT NO. 100: Brief presented by the National Progressive Conservative Student Federation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you present it as you choose.

MR. ROGERS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. First of all, this brief might be rather different from most you have received in that it will not cost any money. Secondly, it will be relatively short since we choose if we have a choice between the use of twenty words and one, to use one.

Gentlemen, this brief is submitted by the National Progressive Conservative Student Federation, which is a national association, made up of the Member Progressive Conservative Clubs on each of

the university campi across Canada.

This brief was authorized by the annual meeting of the student federation held in February of this year, and its purpose is to reflect the views of this association as formulated through the years by resolutions of the Member Clubs.

Perhaps I should say that our organization is composed of all university students comprising several thousands located all over campi across Canada. It was their resolutions through their annual meeting of delegates which inspired this brief. In February delegates representing all the clubs across Canada unanimously approved the idea of a brief and again unanimously approved the draft which was presented at the end of the convention. The brief was then finalized, and presented and has again been approved in its final form by every executive member of the organization. I mention these facts to show this brief represents, as close as is humanly possible the unanimous opinion of every student of the Federation. I may say our Federation is the largest student political organization in Canada.

We urge that the Royal Commission consider including in its report, the following recommendations:

1. Creation by legislation of an Independent Regulatory Board for Canadian broadcasting, to correct the present situation in which one body competes and regulates at the same time.

2. The licencing of additional Television stations in areas which are capable of supporting more than one station and thus providing competition and alternative selection.

Independent Regulatory Board: We wish to recommend that there be created by appropriate legal machinery an Independent Regulatory Board for Canadian broadcasting. This board would not be connected with any operating broadcasting group. It would be subtended below the Minister of Transport and would be the administrative authority recommending to the Minister on applications for grant of radio and television broadcasting licences and related matters.

The principle is clearly established that democracy cannot permit a single body to combine the executive, legislative and judicial functions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where is that principle established?

MR. ROGERS: Mr. Chairman, that principle has been established in the university lectures that I have attended as a student.

THE CHAIRMAN: What sort of lectures?

MR. ROGERS: Political Science lectures, and I presume because it was agreed unanimously by the other students that they were taught a similar opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wish you would give me a reference to that in Canadian Law, if there is such a reference. It is a constitutional

principle in the United States, undoubtedly, but I am asking if you can give me a reference as to where it is in Canada?

MR. ROGERS: At this time, I can't give you a page reference in a text book, but it is principle that I believe and the other students believe has been taught.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am really only asking you for your own words where you say, "the principle is clearly established", and I am asking you to clearly establish it to me. Please go on, I am sorry to interrupt.

MR. ROGERS: Yet these are precisely the conflicting roles now played by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation because of the existing legislation. The CBC performs primarily as a government corporation operating broadcasting stations. It also acts as a regulatory commission in acting quasi-judicially in recommending licences, and legislatively in making regulations, which apply to both itself and independent broadcasting stations with which it competes in its producing capacity. Thus it is forced into the position of being both controller and competitor, both judge and litigant, both judge and prosecutor, or all of these at one time and in one body.

At the present time, the regulatory power in Canadian broadcasting lies in the hands of an operating body. We believe that this is not

compatible with the Canadian concept of democracy, nor with the precedents already laid down in this country in the past, for example, control of the railways and air transport.

The establishment of an Independent Regulatory Board would in no way harm the operations of the CBC nor be contrary to what might be described as the basic philosophy of Canada's present broadcasting structure.

I may say, the question has been asked, Mr. Chairman, "is there any evidence that the CBC has been unfair?". I would say it is the principle that is the only thing to consider. If a thing is wrong in principle, then it doesn't matter how fair the board is. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I think that everybody agrees that the Board has been comprised of outstanding Canadians. It is not the present Board that we are concerned with Mr. Chairman. It is their successors. If the principle is wrong, then we believe it is not important as to whether the Board is fair or not. If there is a possibility of the Board being unfair, then we believe it is wrong.

Licencing of Additional Television Stations:
We wish to recommend the licencing of additional Television stations in areas which are capable of supporting more than one station. We believe that this measure would be a step towards the youth of this country being given a great deal more opportunity

to develop their talents in this industry, and that the Canadian broadcasting industry would be stimulated and developed to the fullest extent because of the resultant competition.

The greatest benefit of all would accrue to the viewing public in these areas, which represent a sizable percentage of the Canadian population, in that at no expense they would have a greater choice of selection and the resultant competition would inevitably mean a gradually increasing standard of entertainment and service.

Perhaps the key words of this brief are Opportunity and Competition.

Our desire is that the public have the opportunity to have better programmes made available to them as a result of competition. We are also extremely anxious that the youth of this country have the maximum opportunity possible in the field of their choice, and that every endeavour should be made to increase these opportunities in their own country. We feel that the abandonment of the monopoly policy and the licencing of additional television stations would be a substantial help in stemming still another export of Canada's "natural resources" to the United States -- our native talent.

It is basic that the choice of programmes lies in the Canadian public. They must have the freedom of choice to choose what programmes they wish to see. Competition plays a large part in providing this choice.

Competition stimulates development! If we have competition, then the public can reasonably be assured that programmes will be presented which they wish to see. In fact, if an independent station were to do otherwise then it would not be long in business. Competition would force the stations to improve their service to the public and would tend towards the best possible programmes being produced.

It, therefore, appears to be in the public interest to allow the licencing of additional television stations at this time. Independent broadcasters have earned the respect of their communities, and have provided a great service to the Canadian people through the years.

I may point out, Mr. Chairman, that there work is well known to be important in their community; they are substantial taxpayers in the community they serve; it is well known during the charity campaigns that they provide free time. However, it is not well known that they are large donors to charity campaigns, which the CBC by law is not required to do. There is the contribution to the Federal Treasury of 50% of the profits.

The need is present; it will benefit the public, and in the years to come should provide a valuable boost to the creation of a distinctive culture in this country.

Canada has been built by pioneers - men with the courage and conviction to try and fulfill

their ideals. The broadcasting business is no exception, and has produced men who have been a great credit and made substantial contributions in their lifetime to the betterment of our country. The licencing of additional television stations will allow the progress of Canadian broadcasting to continue and will, we believe, provide a substantial increase in service to the people of our country.

Competition in any field which will provide a better service to the public is one which should be sought after and cherished.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to add anything at this time to your brief, Mr. Rogers?

MR. ROGERS: No, Mr. Chairman, perhaps there might be a question or two which might stimulate discussion.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure that you were present in the room when I explained this morning our procedure, which is that we are trying by the form of question and answer to get at the exact meaning and contention of the witness.

MR. ROGERS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: But, necessarily, the questions have to be from a rather opposite point of view, and I hope you won't misinterpret that.

MR. ROGERS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Because we are not indicating any judgment in any such questions; but

it is the way we have to proceed if we are going to have questions and answers.

You used the phrase, "if a thing is wrong in principle". Our questions will be confined to the principle as to whether it is right or wrong.

MR. ROGERS: Fair enough.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Mr. Rogers, on page 2, where you are dealing with Independent Regulatory Board, you say this Board "... would be subtended below the Minister of Transport and would be the administrative authority recommending to the Minister on applications for grant of radio and television licences and related matters...". Can you tell us what you have in mind by "related matters"?

MR. ROGERS: Well related matters would be all the other problems that a regulatory board handle other than the actual licencing; for instance, there would disputes between stations, or groups, and all the other everyday problems and arguments that come up.

MR. COYNE: That is, you are including within the phrase "related matters" the non-technical controls that you have in mind - the regulations limiting the amount of advertising and effecting the operation of networks and things of that kind. Is that what you have in mind?

MR. ROGERS: Basically, sir, we believe that the Government should have regulations for

broadcasting and it should be responsible for it; but what we object to is one competitor having the power to decide all matters regarding Canadian broadcasting. It is our proposal to set up an independent board which would have all the regulatory powers.

MR. COYNE: That is my point. In other words your contention is that that board would have all the regulatory powers, let us say, in the same sense that the CBC Board at the moment has all regulatory powers?

MR. ROGERS: That is correct.

MR. COYNE: You speak of it as an Independent Regulatory Board - and I stress the word "Independent" - but you say it would be subtended below the Minister of Transport. I am wondering whether the concept of your Association is an Independent Board or is a Board which is responsible to a Minister of the Crown - to a Government Department, if you like?

MR. ROGERS: "Independent"

there means independent of one or other of the operating groups.

MR. COYNE: At the present time, it has been represented to us - and I think it is correct - that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is independent in the sense that it is a Crown Corporation. It is not operated by Government Department, but is responsible to Parliament as a

whole. Representations have been made to us that this is a desirable thing because it is independent in any event of the Government in Office, which would not be true if it was run by a Minister of the Crown.

The point of my question is whether you wish to change that arrangement by putting this board underneath the Minister of Transport as part of the Department of Transport?

MR. ROGERS: Well, it is actually a tricky thing to describe. The idea is to keep the CBC independent - to keep the CBC independent in its operation. In other words, I think we are all afraid of state radio and state television.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the very point, I think, of Mr. Coyne's question, because we understand you want to get away from the CBC doing the regulation, but you seem to be proposing this new regulatory board should be responsible to the Minister of Transport, which would mean that the Board doing the regulation would then fall under a Minister of the Crown rather than being responsible direct to Parliament as it is today.

Is that your intent?

MR. ROGERS: The intent is that the CBC operations should be largely independent, and the regulations of the broadcasting as a whole - yes - should be subtended below the Minister of Transport,

and be responsible to the Government, because after all the Government should be responsible for the broadcasting industry as a whole. But, on the other hand we do wish to keep the operation of state radio out of the broadcasting industry. I believe there is a distinct difference.....

THE CHAIRMAN: But this operating radio group you are thinking of - the CBC as it is now called - would be subject to these regulations which, you are proposing, would be made by a board responsible to a Department of the Government, rather than to Parliament.

MR. ROGERS: Basically, sir, the broadcasting industry, the same as anything else in the country - and particularly so - is responsible to the Government.

MR. COYNE: Let me interject there. Perhaps this will clarify it. For example, the board which regulates the railways is the Board of Transport Commissioners. The Board of Transport Commissioners is not responsible to any Minister of the Crown or to the Government as such. It is in a sense an independent board.

Now is that the type of board that you have in mind with respect to radio broadcasting?

MR. ROGERS: It is patterned after the approach on that board; but it would be subtended below the Minister of Transport.

MR. COYNE: Going to your next paragraph, Mr. Rogers, you refer to the existing regulations

and the conflicting roles now played by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Then you say: "The CBC performs primarily as a Government Corporation operating broadcasting stations...". And that it also regulates both itself and independent broadcasting stations "with which it competes in its producing capacity".

Now, you have referred to the existing legislation, and it has been represented to us - and a cursory reading of the Broadcasting Act would seem to support it - that so far as the existing legislation is concerned the CBC is primarily charged with carrying on a national broadcasting service within Canada, and in carrying out this primary charge it has the power to operate broadcasting stations and also to integrate private stations into the national broadcasting system - but as a single system.

Would you agree that that is perhaps, equally, a description of the situation under the existing legislation whether it is good, bad, or indifferent.

MR. ROGERS: Well, sir, I think we are both saying the same thing although, perhaps, in different words.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then, you say that you compared this situation with the situation in rail transport, and you say that they are

comparable, and that the same structure of regulating authority should be applied. What I would ask you is that if it is true under the present broadcasting act there is a single national broadcasting system in which both the CBC stations and private stations play their part, whereas in our railway system there are two or more competing and quite equal railway operations, is that situation really comparable at all so that you can draw a precedent from the field of rail transport and apply it to the broadcasting field?

MR. ROGERS: I believe it is, because if you have competition from a state organization, I would suspect that - if, for example, I ran a grocery store on this corner of a street, and across the street they built a new store owned by the Government, and all of a sudden that store started to issue orders as to the time I would close down at night and what time I would open in the morning and what I would charge for certain products and what products I would buy and what products I would sell, I would say that we wouldn't feel that that was fair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Assuming that, how do you say the C.B.C. today competes with the private stations?

MR. ROGERS: Well, I am glad, sir, you asked that question, because I rather expected it.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is a question you had every reason to suspect. We have been searching all over Canada for some answer.

MR. ROGERS: Well, I think that I would not be mistaken in saying that the C.B.C. and the independent stations are in competition for the listening audience. That is, after all, the vital interest of any broadcasting station -- the listener; and that is what the competition actually is -- not finance or sales. Because of the existing legislation the competition is more vague. However, the audience is not vague in any sense. It is direct competition. I can either tune in to one station or another -- the C.B.C. or independent -- here in Toronto or anywhere.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: There is a vast difference, as I see it, Mr. Rogers, between the business carried on the C.N.R. and the T.C.A. and the C.B.C., and it all boils down to the opening line in clause 8 of the Canadian Broadcasting Act:

"The Corporation shall carry on a national
"broadcasting system within Canada "

Now, T.C.A. and the C.N.R. are bound to carry on and give a national service throughout Canada, and the C.B.C. are, subject to their obligations, carrying out that duty, and they carry it through by reason of their own stations in collaboration with the private stations; so that there is a vast difference between the two.

It has been represented to us that, because of that clause in the Act -- that the C.B.C.



shall carry on a national broadcasting service within Canada -- they have a responsibility which they can't shirk and they have got to give a service to everybody in Canada; and, of course, the claim has been made before us that as long as they have the responsibility for doing this they must have the authority to carry out the Act and, as a consequence, they are almost obliged to be the regulating body.

Would you like to say something on that?

MR. ROGERS: Well, sir, as I understand it they have been, up till now, by this Act required to provide a national service to the Canadian public. The answer to that would be that once they provide a national service to the Canadian public themselves there is no reason at all, once that has been done -- the competition should not be there ---

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But they are not providing it by themselves now; they are providing it by reason of co-operation with the private broadcasters, because there are certain parts of Canada into which the C.B.C. doesn't enter, but they enter them through their supplementary and basic stations operated by private operators.

MR. ROGERS: Is there still any reason why -- that would discontinue if there was an independent regulatory board.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us take the case of television, following Mr. Stewart's question, which is, perhaps, a little simpler because there are fewer stations. We have, I think, six areas of

Canada in which there are C.B.C.-operated television stations. You have another 25 or so areas in Canada in which there are private stations operated. It is by the combination of the C.B.C.-operated and the privately-operated stations that the present national television programme gets out across to the Canadian people. Whether it is complete, national coverage yet or not is debatable, but that is the way it is done.

Now, leaving aside the areas of licensing and power control and frequency control and that sort of thing -- channel control -- which is one form of regulation -- do you draw any distinction between that kind of regulation and the other kind of regulation which has to do with the operation of a national system?

MR. ROGERS: Well, sir, taking the example that you give in television I am glad to see that you use the word "co-operation".

THE CHAIRMAN: It is a word suggested to us by the private television operators. They told us that they regarded it as such.

MR. ROGERS: That is exactly what I regard it as, and that is why I can't see why an independent regulatory board would mean that that co-operation would cease.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I am asking you the questions, Mr. Rogers. But the point, to go back to the question of competition between the private operators and the C.B.C. -- in television, of course, at the moment it doesn't, in fact, exist,

because you don't have two stations in one place. That is out for the moment.

MR. ROGERS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: In radio you give the answer that the competition was for the listening audience. Isn't that a little like saying that the Ford Motor Company and the Travel Bureaus are competing for the consumer's entertainment dollar? In a sense it is true, but it is not the kind of direct competition that you were talking about as between your two grocery stores across the corner?

MR. ROGERS: I don't think so. It is a great example of competition -- between the C.B.C. and an independent station. That is to me pure and simple competition.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is where you say the competition rests?

MR. ROGERS: In the final analysis, yes.

MR. COYNE: Turning now to your second point, Mr. Rogers, you recommend the licensing of additional television stations, by which, I presume, you mean additional private television stations?

MR. ROGERS: No, I didn't specify that.

MR. COYNE: That is, they might be either private television stations where the C.B.C. had a station, or a C.B.C. television station where the private operators have stations at the moment?

MR. ROGERS: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Quite so; and then you say that "the resultant competition would inevitably

mean a gradually increasing standard of entertainment and service ... " I am just wondering if you would explain why you say "inevitably", and tell us what you have in mind?

At the present time the C.B.C. is able to produce quite a broad-based programme service, but only through spending large sums of public money. Such sources of public money would not be available to, say, your second private station, and such a station would, presumably, be forced to depend on purely commercial resources. It has been represented to us that this might inevitably, for business reasons, force them to concentrate on the cheaper productions and purely on the imports of American films.

Has your Organization given any study to the economics of television and, particularly, television programme production, and any thought to the type of programmes which might, as a business proposition, be able to be produced through purely commercial resources?

MR. ROGERS: Well, sir, the answer is Yes, we have; and the second point is that I would say the only type of programmes that could be put on if you had competition would be programmes that the people wanted to see, or else they would go out of business. Therefore, I think it would be safe to assume that the type of programme that a competitive station would put on is a programme that the people wanted to see.

MR. COYNE: And would you say that the

demand of the mass audience is the sole criterion as to what should be made available to them?

MR. ROGERS: I believe, sir, that the hope of the people is to be allowed to see the programme that they wish to see. I don't think you can deny them that right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Supposing, for the sake of argument, that the economics of the situation -- just to make it simple -- led, on the private stations, to nothing but American programmes for the entire broadcasting period of the week. Would your Organization regard that as being satisfactory?

MR. ROGERS: We discussed that also, and that is where the independent regulatory board, or, indeed, the present system of regulation would come in, and actually does come in, in limiting the number of hours of programming that can be brought in from the U.S. or, for that matter, from anywhere else. The question arose and it was discussed at some length.

The C.B.C. seems to feel that a certain number of programmes are beneficial. It has been stated in the press -- and this was brought to the attention of our meeting -- that many of the applications of the individual stations who wish to complete are willing to bring in no more than the C.B.C. actually bring in; so that I don't feel on the basis of that evidence that any charge of that nature could be levelled against competition.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is just a question of what you are saying. You, then, I take it from what

you are saying, recognize, or your Organization accepts, the notion that there be, or there is a need of, some programme regulation. Is that contended?

MR. ROGERS: Most definitely, sir.

MR. COYNE: Just coming to the question of this matter of additional stations, Mr. Rogers. It is pointed out that if a second station were possible at no expense to the taxpayer then there should certainly be an opportunity for somebody to establish this second station. Supposing the circumstances were such that it couldn't be done at no expense. For example, representations have been made to us that, in the first place, if they are going to receive the C.B.C. there would be some expense and, secondly, there might be an indirect result, through competition, of a reduction in the C.B.C. revenue which they would then have available to take a television service to other parts of Canada which don't now have a television service. These are just representations that have been made; I am not suggesting that they are necessarily so. But if they were so would your Organization view this thing in this sense, that they would feel that a second station that is costing something, directly or indirectly, should not be allowed until other parts of the country which have no television service at all as yet had been properly served?

MR. ROGERS: Well, sir, that question came up, and as a matter of fact our Organization went to considerable trouble to get as much evidence

and as much testimony and as many views as was possible on all these related charges. We received information from practically every source it was possible. The literature on the desk you see here is literature issued by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, instructing you how to prepare a brief and giving you some suggestions. This is just one example of the literature that we received in trying to present this brief. Frankly, when we got these we were astounded. I don't know how anybody could read through it in three or four months.

But the question was raised about revenue. The first conclusion we came to was that there was in the Toronto market anyway, and, to the best of our knowledge, in all the metropolitan markets, enough advertising revenue possible to support at least one more station. This conclusion was based on statements made in the press and, frankly, just by looking at the situation in similar-sized cities in the United States to find out how many stations they could support.

I would like to make one reference at this stage when the question of finance comes up. A group of us are very interested in good music, and we were wondering why there was not such a thing as a station in Canada purely for good music, to the best of our knowledge. Just a month ago the sixth such station opened in New York. In cities the size of Toronto and much smaller these stations, which cater to minority audiences -- which are quite

sizeable, by the way -- spring up and are commercially sound. It would meet some of the problems of music lovers and other people who don't represent the majority but who still represent a sizeable portion of the audience. In FM they are developing quite a listening audience. This was found to be possible and, by example, was found to be very desirable.

I just throw that out for your consideration. That came up in our discussions.

But we do think there is enough advertising revenue to support one more station. We don't believe that that would limit the amount of revenue to the C.B.C.

I would like to make another point. Every time that one turns on the television set -- at least in the area in which I live -- you see on the American stations Canadian advertising. Well, frankly, that to me is a lost to everybody in the community.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: What is the classification of that advertising? Is it of something that is prohibited here, or is it ...

MR. ROGERS: Not in every case. I presume you are referring to the prohibited ones? No, it is all kinds that I have seen. I will give you one example that I saw just the other night -- Custom Sound and Vision and High Fidelity Shop -- which I am particularly interested in. It is a local outfit. They advertised over it. I have seen all sorts of ads and, I presume, most people in this room have, similarly. But the point I would like to make is

that any person in business realizes that if there is only one person going out after the business he is not going to try as hard or bring out the possible revenue that, if there were two or three competing, would be brought out.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Could I put Mr. Coyne's question to you the other way? While we were on the Prairies, and particularly the Prairies which are not so densely populated, it was contended there that no alternate station -- I wouldn't contended, but, possibly, I should say contended by the majority -- that no alternate stations in densely populated areas should be permitted until such time as a full coverage of the country had been possible.

Now, would you agree with that if, in fact, the alternate station would cost money and would retard the expansion of television throughout the whole length and breadth of Canada?

MR. ROGERS: I would feel, sir, that probably the answer to the question if it would retard -- which we do not believe -- but if it did retard it would depend on how much it did retard it. I think that would be the answer.

We are definitely losing something by not having a competitive service. We are losing the opportunity for young people to have more opportunities, for example, in the arts and in all the various ways that broadcasting helps to develop the native talent. We are losing literally hundreds of our younger members down to the other side of the Border,

and many of our top members.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I think you would agree with me that that is almost inevitable with a market such as they have in the United States of America. If you develop talent there to the point where it is first-class it attracts attention elsewhere. We couldn't pay the salaries that they would get down there.

MR. ROGERS: With the competition in some other industries they do manage to retain top Canadians.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But in the entertainment field you would find it different.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are still comparing a 16-million person audience with a 160-million person audience, and that is a pretty big problem.

MR. ROGERS: I do believe the problem would be helped to some extent if there was more competition made available.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think, Mr. Rogers, it is quite accurate to say that any station, private or public, can be added to the system at no expense to the population of Canada?

MR. ROGERS: Frankly, sir, that is a tricky question.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wasn't trying to be tricky. That is the phrase which is used.

MR. ROGERS: At no expense to the public? That would be, in the case of the C.B.C., the cost of the taxpayers' money to build the station and to

operate the station.

THE CHAIRMAN: My only point is that it is the fact that somebody pays for all these operations, and it is ultimately the Canadian public that pays, isn't it?

MR. ROGERS: That, sir, is a highly theoretical argument that has been used in university debates. I am presuming you are referring to the fact that in the end the public pay for it. I have debated that on occasion, and most people agree that, in the final analysis, that argument is not necessarily so, because advertising actually reduces the cost of a product and by selling more of the product you therefore reduce its over-all cost.

THE CHAIRMAN: At no expense? It seems to me that the expense has to come from somewhere.

MR. ROGERS: Well, sir, I believe that statement is true.

MR. COYNE: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have one or two, but they may have been covered.

What do you mean on page 2 where you say, "We believe that this is not compatible with the Canadian concept of democracy . . ."?

MR. ROGERS: Well, sir, in the last week or two I guess we have all had some thoughts on the Canadian conception ---

THE CHAIRMAN: You are not going to get into the pipeline here!

MR. ROGERS: I wasn't suggesting that we were, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: But how do you mean? How do you define democracy? I am just intrigued by this phrase. If you look it up it is defined as being a system of government where the will of the people is translated either directly or indirectly.

I put the same question to somebody who used the same kind of phrase in Edmonton. The Broadcasting Act of 1936 was passed by Parliament. It hasn't been changed by Parliament. You may not like it, or you may argue against it as much as any other person can argue for it, but how can you say it is undemocratic? It is surely democratic. That is how it came about.

MR. ROGERS: Well, sir, I wouldn't suggest that every Act passed by Parliament is necessarily democratic.

THE CHAIRMAN: If it gets itself passed that is in process of democracy.

MR. ROGERS: The fact that it is passed is democratic, but the actual legislation may, in fact, be undemocratic even although it is passed democratically. Is that not possible?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am just wondering how it is "not compatible with the Canadian concept of democracy..." Is it still this theory of separation of powers you are talking about? Is that the entire point?

MR. ROGERS: Well, sir, we believe it is not competition, because it means that two

competitors are not really competitors when one is judge, jury and hangman over the whole show. That is the point. Basically we believe that would be bad in any industry.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Rogers.

SUBMISSION OF TORONTO TELEVISION OWNERS
ASSOCIATION

APPEARANCE:

Mr. A.A. Marshall.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is that of the Toronto Television Owners Association.

I understand, Mr. Marshall, that you are not going to read it and that you are anxious not to come back this afternoon, that you want to be through this morning?

MR. MARSHALL: I was hoping I would be through this morning when I made the arrangement yesterday.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have taken a little longer than we expected.

MR. MARSHALL: I will be brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well, Mr. Marshall.

It may be necessary for Mr. Stewart to leave for an appointment at noon.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, he is leaving two good men in his place!

THE CHAIRMAN: We will mark your brief as Exhibit 101.

EXHIBIT NO. 101: Brief presented by the Toronto Television Owners Association.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am representing the low brows who are about 80% of the television audience, I would think. We are not interested in being educated. We have nothing against being educated, but we believe that television is fundamentally an entertainment in a relaxing form.

Personally, so far as I am concerned, I have had a television set since there were only 10 in Toronto, and I and thousands like me have been watching Buffalo all these years, and with the C.B.C. deciding to move now from channel 9 to channel 6 we fear it is going to interfere with the Buffalo reception, especially when channel 7, within a year, is to be the National Broadcasting System's new station.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is where?

MR. MARSHALL: In Buffalo. It is controlled by the Great Lakes and Buffalo Courier Express. N.B.C. have been coming over channel 2 and their contract expires in a matter of months, so that it will be channel 7 -- at least, that is what the supposition is.

We don't want this to interfere with our reception in Buffalo. It is all very well to say

that we should watch Canadian programmes. There is no reason why we should watch third-rate Canadian programmes when we can get first-rate American programmes. I have done everything in my power to get a responsible member of the Cabinet to tell me that there would be no interference when they move, and I couldn't get that. I got it from Mr. Dunton and I got it from other members of the public relations of the C.B.C.; and that is all we have had. We have never been able to get that from a responsible member of the Cabinet.

You can go round any night and you can go from door to door and, providing it is not an American programme brought over here, 80% of the T.V. sets would be tuned to Buffalo.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is an estimate, not a matter of a complete survey?

MR. MARSHALL: It is a survey that was made. We made one ourselves.

THE CHAIRMAN: When you say "we" who are you referring to?

MR. MARSHALL: A group of our people who are the Toronto Television Owners Association.

I brought some of these (indicating). I have got 7,000 altogether signed by individuals representing the people.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are these members of an association, paying formal dues?

MR. MARSHALL: No, there are no dues. When we started in 1953 ...

THE CHAIRMAN: When you say "we" whom

do you mean?

MR. MARSHALL: A group of people. We got together and decided there should be an association of ordinary T.V. owners. You hear of all sorts of associations like the National Progressive Conservative Association that was mentioned here this morning, but there was nobody mentioned representing the ordinary people who own T.V. sets. So we organized a meeting down at the Royal York, and about 75 or 80 attended that meeting.

Our primary concern at that time was to discourage the license by the C.B.C. That was in 1953. There was nothing to fight about. We weren't a "gripping" organization. After that we just sort of fell apart until the news came through that they were going to move the channel from 9 to 6. Then we started a skeleton group or organization of four or five men and said: "What are we going to do about it?" So we put an ad in the papers asking if anybody would be prepared to sign a protest form, and we got hundreds and hundreds; so we began distributing these forms. There was no money came in from anybody. I myself underwrote the whole thing -- it was only \$600 or \$700.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Toronto Television Owners Association has no membership fee?

MR. MARSHALL: No. We tried that. It was \$2. I think about 100 people sent it in originally. We asked for voluntary contributions this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: You say your Association has no membership fee. Does it have a membership

card, or an application form, or is it just a list of addresses?

MR. MARSHALL: No, we didn't have a membership card. We just asked people to distribute these forms and asked people to get them signed if they agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Who paid for the ad in the paper and the printing?

MR. MARSHALL: I underwrote the thing myself. We got about \$50 or \$60 in from the public.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I ask what your business is?

MR. MARSHALL: I am a stockbroker.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a matter of personal interest?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes. I don't know anybody in private radio. I have no interest in it at all; but I felt that there was an association required and somebody should do it. We couldn't sit back and say, "Let Joe do it", so I did it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sorry I interrupted you.

MR. MARSHALL: I have got 7,000 of these (indicating) right here to show you.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Is that by the mail -- by sending out a list of addresses and getting a response by mail, or by canvassing from house to house?

MR. MARSHALL: No, we didn't canvass from house to house. First of all, we started off and I went around to my friends and other fellows in the

brokerage business and the Stock Exchange and, naturally, we thought about some form which anybody, if he got a form, would sign it and return it and we would send them a copy. As a matter of fact, in the Town of Newmarket we were asked for 1,000 ---

THE CHAIRMAN: But you haven't any constitution for your Organization -- nor by-laws?

MR. MARSHALL: We had, yes; but there was no membership fee. This is just an organized public protest. This is just a protest.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you go on, please? It is a protest rather than the mechanics of the thing?

MR. MARSHALL: Our point is that we still want to be able to see Buffalo. Maybe there won't be any interference when they move down to channel 6, but we couldn't get anybody responsible outside of the C.B.C. man to say that there wouldn't be any interference.

If there is no interference we are perfectly satisfied.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You mentioned a Cabinet Minister. Have you got the assurance of the C.B.C. that there would be no interference?

MR. MARSHALL: From Mr. Dunton, yes; but we think we are entitled to an answer from the Cabinet which is directly responsible to the people.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: The C.B.C. is responsible to Parliament, not to the Cabinet.

MR. MARSHALL: But I asked to have the question asked in Parliament, and I couldn't get an

answer. Surely we could at least have had that?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, we can't grant you that.

MR. MARSHALL: But that is the principle part of our statement.

We know thousands of people look at the Buffalo programmes. It is all very well to say that they are doing the best that they can, but in the brief today it says that coloured T.V. can't come in until 1960 in Canada. "Bloomer Girl" on Monday night -- you could get it in colour from Buffalo; so the people, if they are not going to see coloured television for four years -- they must get the Buffalo stations.

That is the whole point of our brief -- that we were never able to get an answer from anybody but C.B.C.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But you went to a very responsible place to get an answer.

MR. MARSHALL: No, I don't think so. Getting back to the previous speaker, the C.B.C. is a paid public servant, isn't it?

Aren't we entitled to an answer from somebody responsible to the people?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: They are responsible to the people -- the C.B.C. are -- and they have the technical knowledge which no Cabinet Minister has. If he were to get your answer he would have to go to the C.B.C. to find out. When you have got the answer from the Chairman of the C.B.C. it seems to me that you have got the best authority.

MR. MARSHALL: They are still public servants.

MR. COYNE: I want to interject there. I was just wondering whether you were expecting a formal guarantee that under no circumstances would there be interference with anybody who was now getting the Buffalo station anywhere. There might be somebody down in St. Thomas ---

MR. MARSHALL: We don't want a guarantee; but, at least, the public can always have recourse if they have been misled by the Government -- there is always an election day and if they want to take down the Government at that time they can do so; but you have no recourse against the C.B.C.

MR. COYNE: One other question: You are not recommending that channel 6, which is one of only two television stations which have been allocated to the Toronto area by international agreement -- that it should stand vacant for all time to come on the off-chance that there would be interference with Buffalo?

MR. MARSHALL: That is something for the international agreement, because the C.B.C. knew they had that channel before they went on channel 9.

MR. COYNE: Suppose they remained on channel 9. Do you support the representations for a second T.V. outlet operating in Toronto?

MR. MARSHALL: I am not advocating a private station.

THE CHAIRMAN: But, throughout your brief, you frankly refer somewhat critically to the monopoly of the C.B.C.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Therefore, I would assume that you would want to see that monopoly of the C.B.C. in Toronto ended.

MR. MARSHALL: Ended in the sense that I wouldn't like to see the St. Lawrence Seaway Project operated by Abitibi.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you agree there should be another station in Toronto?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, but I don't favour it on channel 6.

THE CHAIRMAN: But Mr. Coyne's point is that there is an existing international agreement and there are only two channels -- 6 and 9.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, the international agreement gave Orillia channel 3, but they gave it to Barrie. Barrie didn't have channel 3.

They can change the international agreement.

MR. COYNE: I am not a technical man, and I take it you are not either?

MR. MARSHALL: I am not.

MR. COYNE: But I am talking about this aspect of it: You are worried about channel 6. First of all, you are worried about channel 6 interfering with channel 2.

MR. MARSHALL: No, not channel 2. No, I am not.

MR. COYNE: Well, then, you are concerned about channel 4?

MR. MARSHALL: 4 and 7.

MR. COYNE: I understand that so far as 4 and 6 are concerned frequency-wise there is, between them, not only the full width of channel 5 band but also an additional four megacycles devoted to point-to-point and other special fields of radio communication.

MR. MARSHALL: I have had that told me a number of times.

MR. COYNE: And also that, so far as channel 7 is concerned, there is more difference frequency-wise between 6 and 7 than there is between 9 and 7.

On what technical basis do you feel that there will be any interference?

MR. MARSHALL: We have been told by technicians -- and I can't give you their names because they have asked me not to -- that there could be interference. But the point of this is that if there will not be any interference why can't we get the Government to tell us that?

THE CHAIRMAN: Nobody can guarantee ---

MR. MARSHALL: I am not asking for a guarantee. If the people are misled they always have the chance -- if they don't like them they can put them out of power.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are a lot of things the Government can't tell us. I would like to know when they are going to cut taxes!

MR. MARSHALL: At the same time, if they are so positive and the C.B.C. tells them why can't they tell us?

MR. COYNE: But your position is that you haven't evidence to show that there will be interference?

MR. MARSHALL: No.

MR. COYNE: Your only concern is that you haven't received satisfactory assurances ---

MR. MARSHALL: That is so.

MR. COYNE: --- that there will not be?

MR. MARSHALL: They said there would be no interference when Barrie went on. If you were to go up to Willowdale and Newmarket and ask the people up there -- they get all kinds of reception.

MR. COYNE: I suppose the best way to avoid interference would be not to transfer any station at all in Canada within 50 miles ---

MR. MARSHALL: They have got 9, 11 and 15 up there.

THE CHAIRMAN: You suggest in your brief, and again today, that there should be an end to this monopoly and, therefore, there should be an additional station of some kind in Toronto for freedom of choice; and you are concerned also that you don't want anybody to get on channel 6. There are only two channels available to Toronto at the moment.

MR. MARSHALL: Channel 11 was available to Toronto and they gave it away to Hamilton.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has gone to Hamilton.

MR. MARSHALL: But the C.B.C. did that.

THE CHAIRMAN: The C.B.C. didn't. It was the Department of Transport.

MR. MARSHALL: It is always the Department of Transport when you get them in a spot. They do pass the buck to the Department of Transport.

THE CHAIRMAN: Which of the two do you prefer -- to get away from the evils of monopoly, or to get away from the evils of having channel 6 occupied?

MR. MARSHALL: The evils of having channel 6 occupied.

THE CHAIRMAN: You will take the monopoly and take the risk on that?

MR. MARSHALL: Then, there is no monopoly so far as I am concerned because I can still see Buffalo.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you anything to ask, Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: No, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your brief is limited to that point?

MR. MARSHALL: That is the principle part of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it is only fair to say that we don't want to hold you up, and if you were returning this afternoon we might ask you questions about it; so that the fact that we do not is not to be taken as unwillingness to ask you these questions.

--The hearings adjourned at 12.40 P.M. until 2.30 P.M.

---On resuming at 2.30 P.M.:

SUBMISSION OF TORONTO AND DISTRICT TRADES
AND LABOUR COUNCIL
AND
TORONTO AND LAKE SHORE LABOUR COUNCIL

THE CHAIRMAN: The first brief we are to hear this afternoon is the Toronto and District Trades and Labour Council brief, which, I believe, is also the Toronto and Lake Shore Labour Council brief; it is a joint brief of the two organizations. We will start by marking this brief as Exhibit 102.

EXHIBIT NO. 102: Brief of Toronto and District Trades and Labour Council and Toronto and Lakeshore Labour Council.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand the brief is to be presented by Mr. Hamilton, and Mr. Jenoves and Mr. Kearns are also with you?

MR. HAMILTON: Yes, and Mr. Archer, who is president of the Toronto and Lakeshore Council.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you gentlemen were not present this morning when I explained the procedure. We mark the brief as an exhibit and then ask you to present it in whatever way seems best to you, either by reading it or summarizing it or explaining it as you choose. After that we try to ask questions which are designed solely to bring out the points, and by putting opposite points of view to you for your opinion with no indication to you that we have reached any conclusion, but just to get at the facts. Will you proceed, then, Mr. Hamilton, to present this brief?

MR. HAMILTON: Mr. Chairman and members of

the Commission, as you indicated this brief is presented on behalf of the Toronto and District Trades and Labour Council, which is representative of the organized labour movements in the metropolitan Toronto and area and represents about 110,000 affiliated members throughout our various organizations. Our brief is a brief brief and we will try to be brief with our brief as we have it here.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is plenty of time, take your time.

MR. HAMILTON: I appreciate that and we are not going to rush but we are going to highlight the brief as we go along.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have all read it so you can start with that.

MR. HAMILTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have set out our brief under the following headings: (1) Additional television outlets in Toronto area; (2) Financing; (3) Programming; (4) Public Relations; (5) Radio Broadcasting; (6) Television-Radio Centre. I think, Mr. Chairman, that these all come under your Terms of Reference.

Now, in the matter of television outlets in the Toronto area, we make our first point which is that we are of the opinion that it is the duty of the CBC to provide radio and television coverage to every part of our country as soon as possible. We say:

"Duplicate or triplicate coverage for certain areas should not be

undertaken until national coverage has been completed. Complete Canadian coverage is the first job which has to be done and nothing should hamper this work."

That is the first point I would like to make. We say there is no need for a second outlet in Toronto and area until national coverage has been completed. The second point we would like to make is that television broadcasting in Canada has developed rapidly under public enterprise, and only in very rare and exceptional cases should it be turned over to private owners, and in no case should a licence be granted to a person who now operates a private radio station or is in the newspaper field. Our experience in the Toronto area with the private radio stations has not been too good, and we suggest that their conduct and activity have not recommended them getting into the television field. That is why we are opposed to the private people getting into the field of television, and that is the second point we would like to make under that heading.

Now, the matter of competition has been raised and we have heard very much about it, and our opinion on this matter is that the only way there can be any real competition in Toronto would be for the private stations to affiliate with the United States networks. This, of course, we are completely opposed to. In any case, these networks can be seen by Toronto set owners through Buffalo. The

fact that the CBC have successfully operated two radio stations in Toronto, CJBC and CBL, lead us to believe the same can be done in the television field. Therefore we urge that when any new television outlets are opened in the Toronto area they should be opened and operated by the CBC. These are the highlights and the points we would like to emphasize and raise on the matter of television outlets in the Toronto area.

The second matter we would like to raise is the matter of financing and the matter of financing, I think, on a broad general basis has been covered adequately in our national brief that was presented to you in Ottawa.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the Canadian Labour Congress?

MR. HAMILTON: Yes, the Canadian Labour Congress brief which was presented to you in Ottawa, and it deals with the financing in more detail and on a broader basis. We just deal with it now in the local and Toronto and area level. The points we would like to make on this level is that we are of the opinion that the CBC should be financed by direct grants from the Federal Government, with some long-term financial arrangements worked out with the CBC so that they will not be hampered in their expansion programme and we will be able to keep abreast of developments. In other words, we say it should not be on a year-to-year basis as it heretofore has been but should be on a broad or an extended

period of time, and we suggest possibly four or five years, or something in the future so the CBC can have some mobility and can move around and do some of the development it must do as a result of the expanding field they are in.

The other point under financing we would like to make is that we are absolutely opposed to any suggestion that we return to the old form of any individual set licence fee, which was used in years past to finance radio broadcasting, before the television field came in. We are of the opinion that is not a satisfactory method of financing, and our position here in the Toronto area is that we are opposed to that sort of financing. Those are the highlights of the position we take in regard to the matter of financing.

In the matter of programming, I would like to say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that we feel the CBC have generally done a very good job of programming. Canadian produced shows have improved considerably, particularly over the past year, and some of our Toronto-produced shows now compare favourably with the best produced in the United States. There are, however, some comments and criticisms that we would like to make about programmes and programming generally. The first point is that we feel the CBC coverage of sports events, such as hockey matches, the Grey Cup game, the CNE swim, are excellent and should be expanded when and where possible. Television news broadcasts leave a lot to be desired, and

we suggest that there should be more local news coverage on a daily basis and more "on the spot" news coverage. The ratio of international news to local news is out of all proportion on CBLT. In our opinion, one thing that has been of a griping nature in this area is the matter of news times, news time should be adhered to as much as possible, and only on very extra special occasions should they be tampered with. We think the news should have priority, and one of the practices of the CBC which we feel should be discontinued is that of running programmes from the large United States networks a week after they have been shown on one of the Buffalo stations. We feel this is a waste of valuable television time, as most Toronto viewers have already seen it. Even worse than that, it encourages CBLT viewers to switch to another channel. If these programmes must be shown we suggest that they should be run at the same time in Toronto as on the United States network, otherwise they should be discontinued.

Now we would like to say that we are of the opinion that the CBC has done a good job on current affairs, and the ratio of time allotted for current affairs appears to be reasonably good. Such programmes as This Week, Tabloid, Fighting Words, Citizens' Forum, etc. cover this field adequately. We feel, however, a complaint we hear rather often is that the Citizens' Forum show is too short, and that it could be extended for another fifteen minutes at least. That is, in a general way, our comments

on the matter of programmes and programming in general.

The next matter, I think, is one that has caused us more concern as labour people than any other here, and I will just take it from our brief as we have it. This is the matter of public relations and we are certainly disturbed about it. For years we have watched the CBC become the target of verbal and written abuse from many quarters, and CBC officials sit idly by and ignore these attacks and do little or nothing about them. It is in this area that we would point out our strongest criticism of the CBC. Almost daily in our newspapers we see letters to the editor condemning the CBC for something or other. Private radio stations, through their associations, have had a field day attacking the CBC. Criticism is a good thing when it is justified. However, when criticism is not based on facts and when it goes unanswered, it can do considerable harm. We would venture to guess that only a very small percentage of the Canadian population is familiar with the CBC, how it is established, who are on the Board of Governors, who is the General Manager, and so forth. We believe that it is the job of the CBC to inform the general public about its problems and activities. This is something which they have failed to do.

We have in Canada a unique publicly owned system of broadcasting that compares favourably with any other system in the world. Why don't we say so?

Ignorance is the one thing that can do more harm to the CBC than any other single factor. If the public realized the job that was being done and the problems involved, we are sure that they would be far more considerate than they have been in the past. Education is one of the many uses of modern television and we suggest that the CBC could very well use some of the educational periods to acquaint the Canadian public with the facts about their own broadcasting system.

The people of Canada own their own radio and television network and it is recognized as one of the best in the world. This should be a matter of great national pride. Yet too many people in Government and the CBC take an apologetic attitude as though a publicly owned operation was something shameful. Others treat it like the black sheep of the family, which is tolerated as long as it stays out of sight and does not try to defend itself. This is an impossible situation. Many of the most efficient and successful services we have today in Canada are publicly owned, such as the C.N.R., Ontario Hydro, the Toronto Transit System, etc.. It is about time that we Canadians began to beat our chests and crow a little about such successful Canadian public enterprises as the CBC. We urge that there be a complete review of the whole public relations department of the CBC and that it be allotted sufficient funds to do a proper job.

Of course, there are many suggestions we

could make about ways and means of improving public relations. One very obvious one is to expand the present CBC Times and have it put on the news stands so that people can have it and know about the work of the CBC. We also suggest that graphs used on CBC station breaks carry a statement simply saying "This is your publicly owned Canadian Broadcasting Corporation".

It is unfortunate but too few people know the CBC and how it functions. Many of those who derive the most benefit from it are the ones who knock it the most. Education is the only way to overcome this and it simply must be done. We must have an approach to public relations through a planned public relations programme. I think they have done a good job and we say that certainly they deserve to say to the public that they are doing a good job and show them some of the problems which they have encountered. That covers our submission on that particular aspect of it.

We will come now to the matter of radio broadcasting and we would like to make it clear at the outset that anything we have suggested in the field of television should not in any way detract from radio broadcasting. Of all the things we have talked about and recommended be done, nothing should be done to detract from the thing that should be expanded rather than contracted.

The other criticism we have to make about radio is that the CBC have not altogether made the

private stations live up to the rules and regulations which they have set down, and we suggest that the CBC should see to it that all radio stations adhere strictly to Rule 7 of the CBC Regulations which covers the sound broadcasting, and it sets out the times that they have for commercials. Now, I have to say this, we have not done any monitoring and have no evidence to show the actual times involved, nor do we have access to the logs of the stations to see that they have abused this rule, but I think the ordinary listener who listens to the radio will realize it is being abused. There was a time when certainly you could get some good music on radio which was indispersed once in a while with commercials, but unfortunately the very opposite is in vogue now, we get continuous commercials indispersed with a little music, and I think it is an obvious fact that the regulations are either horribly wrong or are not being lived up to.

Now, the other real criticism that we have of the private broadcasting stations in particular is a matter that they have not used talent, Canadian talent, to the best advantage. I think, as a matter of fact, they have used little or no talent on their programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: When you say that, are you referring to the CBC?

MR. HAMILTON: I am referring now to the private radio stations, Mr. Chairman. Now, we say that part of this is certainly the fault of the CBC

because they know what the private radio stations are doing because they have their logs and they are supposed to know what they are doing, and part of the regulations are that they must ensure the greater use of Canadian talent. I think the private stations have ignored that and the CBC have continued to let them ignore it. I think they are both at fault in that regard.

The other point I would like to make about radio broadcasting is that in each annual report the CBC should give a much more comprehensive report about the activities of private stations, and it should be made public. It should show the number of people employed, wave length, the amount it cost the CBC to subsidize a particular station, their financial statements and a complete report of their activities so the general public can know what the private stations are doing and whether they are living up to the regulations as set down. That briefly and in a general way outlines our position on radio broadcasting, and some of the complaints, and I should say that this brief is primarily a local brief, not national in character, but it covers our groups in the metropolitan Toronto area.

The last thing we would like to deal with, and I think possibly the most expedient and quickest way to deal with it is to read from the brief also, because it is rather short, and that is the matter of the television-radio centre here in the City of Toronto. Suitable premises are urgently needed for

the CBC's operations in Toronto. It would be of value locally, as well as nationally, for the CBC to have in this area a radio and television centre designed to house at one location all the necessary offices, studios and other facilities for its operations here. For a variety of reasons Toronto is the main point of origin for Canadian programmes in the English language, and no doubt it will continue to be for some years to come. It is quite possible, too, that colour television in Canada will have its beginnings in Toronto.

It should be remembered also that because of the enviable reputation the CBC has earned abroad, a large number of visitors from other countries come to Canada to learn at first hand how our publicly owned broadcasting system works. Most of these visitors spend a good deal of their time at the CBC's Toronto offices and studios. One cannot help wondering what their reaction must be to the patchwork of inadequate, makeshift buildings in which these offices and studios are housed. There is very little evidence that this whole matter has received the attention it deserves from the responsible authorities in government or from members of the CBC's Board of Governors, with the exception, perhaps, of the chairman.

The kind of centre we would like to see would not only serve its main purpose but would be a show place for the city, of which both the people of Toronto and Canadians generally would be proud.

As of the middle of March of this year the Corporation's offices and studios were situated in no fewer than sixteen buildings scattered over a large area. We have listed them in the brief and I will not go into them now. Since that time I am led to believe they have also rented one or two other places, and I am also informed that they have now started to put another patchwork on the existing studio on Jarvis Street.

We suggest that the members of this Commission should inspect some, if not all, of these buildings and see for themselves the state of affairs that has been allowed to develop. They should, we believe, discuss the situation with some of the people who have to contend with the many problems which must inevitably arise from such inadequate housing. Of the buildings used for radio and television broadcasting only one, the TV building on Mutual Street, was actually designed for its present use. That is not to say that even it is adequate for its purpose. On the contrary, it is an architectural monstrosity both as to function and appearance. It must have been obvious before its construction began that it would be too small, to say nothing of its other limitations. This whole situation seems to reflect a short-sighted, even niggardly attitude towards an institution which is one of our main instruments for developing a sense of Canadian unity and Canadian nationhood. The cost of operating under existing conditions would be hard to assess, either

in terms of money or in terms of wear and tear on the men and women who have the day to day responsibility for CBC operations in Toronto. There can be little doubt that it is inefficient and uneconomic in the extreme. The cost of building a centre will be high, but the longer this undertaking is delayed the costlier it will be. The money should be provided out of the general revenue of Canada for it will be spent on services for all the people of Canada. The approach must be bold and imaginative, not half-hearted and timorous. We trust that the members of this Commission will give this matter their most serious consideration, and urge that action be taken with a minimum of delay.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the course of reading newspaper accounts of your hearings it has come to light in the accounts that the CBC used for cartage purposes alone something like \$300,000 per annum here and in Montreal. Now, that in itself, I suggest to you, is an argument, and a very substantial argument, for building not only here in Toronto but in Montreal as well, if that is the case, because the \$150,000, if it were split in two, is a very substantial figure that would go towards the building of a new centre here, and if you analyse it and amortize it over a ten-year period it certainly is a lot of money and would go a long way to providing an adequate building here to do the job that has to be done.

Now, Mr. Chairman and members of the

Commission, that is very roughly our position on these matters as we find them locally, and we shall be very glad to answer any questions which may arise.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are grateful to you for a very competent summary of a much longer brief, but I think you have hit the highlights as they struck me when I read them, and it is necessary to get them into our minds before we start questioning. Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Mr. Hamilton, turning to your first point as to the matter of the additional television outlets in the Toronto area, you point out that in your opinion it is the duty of the CBC to provide complete national coverage and you think this should have priority over the building of alternate or duplicate stations in areas that are already served. You say:

"Complete Canadian coverage
is the first job which has to be done
and nothing should hamper this work.
Then you say that it is not yet timely to have an additional television outlet in the Toronto area. Now, supposing a second television station could be established in Toronto by private operators at no cost in public funds, directly or indirectly, therefore, without hampering in any way the CBC in its extension of coverage to those areas in Canada that are not yet served at all, do you feel that in those circumstances it still would not be timely to have a second station in Toronto?

MR. HAMILTON: Well, I would like to answer your question in a way that may be rather derogatory, but I think it is wishful thinking to think you could have a private broadcast and television station in Toronto without costing the CBC anything, because, as we know, in front of this Commission it has been indicated by officials in the CBC that every private television station that comes into operation now costs the CBC in programmes alone an amount of something like \$100,000 a year. So, to answer your question in that way, I don't think it is a practical thing to say you could have another station here without costing the taxpayers anything, and the only other way, as we suggest in our brief, is that it could be hooked up with another United States network, and we are opposed to that absolutely.

MR. COYNE: This statement about costing the CBC \$100,000, kine recordings to connect up the network, that is true at the present time when there is only one outlet in any area, so that that is an outlet for CBC programme.

MR. HAMILTON: I think that was the figure that was quoted where you would add a new station in, say, Regina or any other place that has not got it -- Sherbrooke, Quebec, if they haven't one. That is, to put it into the present system and feed it with existing programmes.

MR. COYNE: But the suggestion made in some places is that people are willing to put up a second station that would not be a drain on the CBC for any

programmes or items of expense at all. That may be so or not, but my question is, if it were established that a private television station could be established in Toronto right now without it costing the CBC anything, and therefore not hampering its extension of national service, which may be a big "if", would you still oppose a second alternative outlet?

MR. HAMILTON: I would have to say this, that it is a matter of fact that by its very nature radio and television is a monopoly. It has to be because of the limited number of channels, and certainly, if you are going to open another station in the Toronto area, we would first like to see it opened by the CBC, and, secondly, if it is going to private people we would want to have the closest kind of scrutiny exercised.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it may be implicit in your answer, but I would like to know if it is so; you also would expect that any such private station would be subject to some form of programme control to prevent the tie-up which you disapprove of with the American networks?

MR. HAMILTON: Absolutely.

MR. COYNE: But the emphasis in your last answer was upon the closest sort of scrutiny over anyone who was to be granted a licence for a private television station. Just going on from there, and on page 3 of your brief where you refer to the question of whether television licences should be

granted to owners of radio stations or owners of newspapers, you say:

"In no case should a licence be granted to any person who now operates a private radio station or is in the newspaper field."

Do you envisage that or recommend an outright prohibition against duplicate ownership of that kind in all and any sets of circumstances?

MR. HAMILTON: At this stage of the game I would have to say yes. Our experiences throughout the province -- and this is a Toronto brief, but we have to be guided by experiences throughout the province -- are that the dangers are still there in the large cities, but in a small town where they control the newspaper and radio and television, certainly under those circumstances they would not be. Let us suppose one of our large Toronto newspapers bought the television outlet here in the city -- I am not suggesting for a moment they would -- but I am saying there is certainly a great temptation put in the hands of those people to abuse that sort of communication they have control of, and I think rather than open the door a little bit at this stage of the game we would wish the Board to say, "No, they have their paper field, and they should stay out of the television field".

MR. COYNE: What really leads me to the question is this, that there would appear to be two alternative ways of doing it: you could have an

outright statutory provision against it, or you could have a policy that such licences would not be granted unless there were overriding circumstances which may justify it, the sort of circumstances where in some town the person who runs the newspaper or radio station is the only person with the qualified experience or the necessary capital funds to operate a station in that area.

MR. HAMILTON: We are dealing with the Toronto area, and we don't think that holds true in Toronto.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, what abuses could come from the ownership of a television station in Toronto by one of the newspapers? What do you visualize there? You spoke of abuses that may creep in.

MR. HAMILTON: I would have to go back to put it on, firstly, a small town basis, that where the only radio station and the only newspaper and the only television outlet -- that is, the ultimate in control of communications in that particular locality, and of course, the same principle holds true only to a lesser degree, if the same thing were allowed to develop in the Toronto area. If one of the large papers got the television outlet, then the same principles that apply on a small town basis could apply here. You may very well argue, but not to the same extent; I might agree with you, but the same temptation to completely control is then put in the hands of these people.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes, but radio especially can be picked up here from any number of centres, so that the possibility of abuse in so far as radio is concerned does not seem to be too great. You can pick up Hamilton or any of those stations around, so you are not pinned down to any one outlet.

MR. HAMILTON: No. I say the impact is not as great in a big city, but our position has to be that we are opposed to it in principle. Once the duplication starts we don't know where it ends, so in principle we are opposing it.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have mentioned the case of the newspaper, radio and television. I am not positive of this, but I think the general brief in Ottawa from the Canadian Labour Congress drew a distinction between cases where a newspaper publisher was going into television, and where a radio station only was going in. In other words, do you accept the notion of radio and television being reasonable partners together in these communications enterprises, or would you extend your point to the point that a radio station operator ought not to get a television licence?

MR. HAMILTON: That is our position.

THE CHAIRMAN: Am I right in that recollection, that there was a distinction between the newspaper publisher and the radio station operator?

MR. COYNE: That is my recollection, Mr. Chairman. Less objection certainly was taken to so-called pairs in a single community. I think

objection was registered to there being ownership in different communities.

MR. HAMILTON: I think the Chairman is quite correct, that that is the position of the brief in Ottawa.

MR. COTTERILL: The answer to the question referring specifically to the Toronto area is simply that we have in the Toronto area been reduced, despite the growing size of the city, to three newspapers. There used to be more than three. The tendency is constantly to fewer newspaper publications. Television is a complete monopoly situation, and there is only one possible channel available in this area. If that were acquired by a newspaper it would mean that newspaper would have one more complete source of news coverage, and we think it is not a good thing for the free enterprise they are talking about that there should be this type of monopoly.

MR. COYNE: On the general question of monopoly it has been suggested to us from time to time that monopoly is dangerous in anybody's hands -- in the hands of the private enterprise or in the hands of a government, and particularly that there is a danger in a field of communication arising out of a government or government agency having a monopoly of the field. Would you express some views on that question?

MR. HAMILTON: Well, we have dealt with the thing as we have lived with it, and I think that is the only way we can analyse it and look at it, and I

don't think there has been any proof anywhere that I have seen, or that our organization has seen, that indicates the CBC has a monopoly and has abused their position as such, and we don't think that the controls and the things that are on the CBC through the Government in the first instance, and the Board of Governors and down through their whole organization, we have nothing that would indicate to us that they have been abused. So, we have to go along with them.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Have you any evidence of abuse in the dual ownership of newspaper and radio? You say there has not been abuse in the case of government monopoly of TV and radio. On the other hand, has there been abuse in the case of private enterprise in the handling of newspapers and radio?

MR. HAMILTON: I think you will get your information, if this particular organization has not submitted their brief as yet, when they do so, but the people in the Television Unions have submitted, or will submit to your Commission, some pretty substantial evidence in that regard, and I haven't got the evidence here, but Peterborough is one that comes to my mind as having been mentioned in their submission to you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We haven't had that brief yet.

MR. HAMILTON: But that evidence will be there for you.

THE CHAIRMAN: On this question that Mr. Coyne and Mr. Stewart have been asking about, again

this theory or principle and the way it is stated is that there is a danger in having government monopoly in the field of communications. It may be, and it has been suggested that the situation being what it is in Canada, the things we want to achieve being what they are, it is necessary for us to have something such as the CBC, but if there are dangers -- even though they are only theoretical dangers at the moment -- have you any suggestions as to possible safeguards that can be introduced to at least minimize those dangers?

MR. HAMILTON: Again I have to answer you as I answered Mr. Coyne, and that is that we have no evidence to date, since 1933, when it came into existence, up to now, that the set-up of the CBC has abused the monopoly which they have under their guidance, and we say that is a pretty fair test, and we suggest it be left the way it is.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just to take a specific case: there have been various suggestions -- one, I think, this morning -- which seem to indicate that the contention was that the CBC, or whatever it is called, should be placed under a Minister or a Government department rather than responsible directly to Parliament as it is now. Have you any views on that kind of specific set-up?

MR. HAMILTON: We have. Again I have to answer this in the same way as I answered you before, which sounds like repetition, but it is not, because we have, I think, over the years an experience that

the CBC, under the Board of Governors and their responsibility to Parliament through the various Parliamentary Committees, and that sort of thing, and their reports being made public, have done a very good and very satisfactory job, and we would not want to see it either under a Minister or changed in any way -- under any regulatory body or under a Minister, but simply left and given the money to operate the way they could properly operate and left the way they are.

THE CHAIRMAN: You think from your point of view it would be preferable to leave it responsible directly to Parliament rather than to transfer it to a Minister of a department?

MR. COTTERILL: The simple way of putting it is this, that at the present time we don't have a government owned radio and television. It is publicly owned. There is a big difference. One of the reasons why it is different is because it is responsible to Parliament. Government is merely an agency for governing and also responsible to Parliament. Under the present arrangement it is responsible to Parliament and it is publicly owned and that is the way it should be kept.

MR. COYNE: Still on page 3, and on a slightly different point, you say in the second last paragraph:

"Even with the CBC there are plenty of the so-called soap opera type of programmes with their usual accompanying singing commercials and so forth."

Do you believe that soap operas should be eliminated altogether? When asking that question I have in mind some remarks that you make further along about the necessity of maintaining a balanced programme, and also about the desirability of the CBC obtaining commercial revenues to the maximum extent possible.

MR. HAMILTON: I didn't pick out soap operas as such. I said, the type of programme which is a light heart-rending sort of drama they put on in the afternoons. It is a cheap sort of programme production-wise and otherwise, and is run on a number of stations, and that type of programme certainly has a place in things, but it certainly should not monopolize the time available either on radio or television.

MR. COYNE: You would not say it monopolized the time available now?

MR. HAMILTON: No, not particularly.

MR. COYNE: This is not specifically a criticism of the private stations because the soap operas are carried widely on the CBC networks?

MR. HAMILTON: I would say so.

MR. COYNE: Just over on page 4, in the first paragraph, I think it is perhaps reverting to a subject we discussed earlier, and you say:

"Now, this, in our opinion,
is simply misleading propaganda,
as any private person attempting to
operate a station in the Toronto area
would be greatly dependent upon the

CBC for many things."

Could you be a little more specific as to what you have in mind there? Are you thinking in terms of programmes?

MR. HAMILTON: Programming and production. I don't think, outside of possibly some of the private studios who have production facilities -- and there are only one or two of these, to my knowledge -- there are no production facilities in the Toronto area, and I can't see any private people going into the production of programmes unless again, as I say, they went to the United States networks for them, and they would certainly have to be dependent upon -- under the present regulations they would have to be dependent upon the very regulations, as anyone else is; in any part of the country the same thing would hold as it does for Toronto.

MR. COYNE: But you had in mind there programming which, so we have been given to believe, certain private applicants would programme their stations, if awarded licences, with only such CBC programmes as the CBC wanted them to carry?

MR. HAMILTON: Well, I have to say this, that if you look back through the many years of these people's activity in the radio field -- and I can only refer to the people in the private radio field -- they have done, to my knowledge -- and I may be wrong -- but to my knowledge they have done nothing to produce anything in the way of live drama or live programmes, of any kind at all. So,

I am assuming their behaviour in the television field would be much the same as it has been in the radio field.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: We have had examples put before us in the West, particularly in Calgary, where a private broadcasting station seems to have had a considerable amount of live talent on their shows and have brought forward a lot of good talent in this way.

MR. HAMILTON: Well, I have to say this; I have to admire them for it, but I have to say it certainly is the exception rather than the rule; there is no question about that.

MR. COYNE: In the next paragraph on page 4 you say:

"A glance at the number of CBC programmes now being carried by private TV outlets in Canada at considerable expense to the CBC shows that these people would not be providing competition."

Surely at the present time there is no suggestion of competition in the television network?

MR. HAMILTON: There is a question arising that they should have their own network -- the private people -- they should have their own network and there would, in fact, be competition.

MR. COYNE: But are you not using the present situation in which there is designedly no competition, to say that if there were additional

stations there would not be any competition?

MR. HAMILTON: That is correct.

MR. COYNE: But isn't it a non sequitur?

There cannot possibly be any competition in the present situation where you have a single channel policy.

MR. HAMILTON: Certainly there can't be competition now under the CBC regulations. They are supposed to be part of the system, but I sometimes wonder -- they are supposed to be part of the system. I am of the very firm opinion that I don't think the people can produce, and that the very fact that we cannot produce now, and cannot pay for the productions we have now in television, and are in financial troubles with our national system, which is the reason for setting up this Commission, is pretty good evidence that the private people cannot finance and set up proper programming on a Canadian level without assistance from the American production facilities.

THE CHAIRMAN: Isn't the question you are asking, Mr. Coyne, on that sentence -- isn't the sentence really based on almost a misconception of what would probably happen if there were a second outlet? You are assuming here that they would be carrying CBC programmes, and a second outlet in Toronto, unless you have got two separate CBC television networks, obviously the same station would not carry the same programmes as the existing CBC TV station. Therefore, it seems to me you have assumed they would automatically be getting

programmes from the CBC which they may not be.

MR. HAMILTON: Let me put it another way: most of the Canadian public -- and I think I am right -- are of the firm opinion that the private station in Hamilton constitutes keen competition for the CBC, and they say the reason we should have one in Toronto is because of the fact that any private station in Toronto would create competition for CBLT. It is not just so; it is not competition at all; it is part of the same network.

THE CHAIRMAN: What you are saying is the fact it is a privately operated station in Hamilton, does not, because it is private, constitute competition for the CBC because they are part of the CBC network?

MR. HAMILTON: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: I get your point now.

MR. COYNE: Turning to the next section on finance, just one question, Mr. Hamilton, on page 5:

" . . . the CBC will have to be assured sufficient finance to do the job and we are of the opinion that it should come, as much as possible, from sale of commercial programmes."

What do you mean by "as much as possible"? Should the CBC go out and sell everything they possibly can and commercialize the network, or do you envisage regulations restricting or limiting commercial operations much the same as we have at the present time?

MR. HAMILTON: Very much the same as we have at the present time, but I think the point I am trying to make to this Commission is that it should take a look at the revenue to be derived from the sale of commercial programmes, and certainly there will have to be some regulation or some stipulations in this regard, but it may be we are not getting full value out of our commercial programmes at the present time. I am not prepared to say whether we are or not, but I simply say this body could take a look at that, and we simply say that as much revenue as possible should be derived in the best interests of the Canadian people.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: In your remarks when you presented the brief, I think you intimated that you didn't feel that we should go back to licence fee?

MR. HAMILTON: That is right.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Would you care to express a view on the present system of excise taxes?

MR. HAMILTON: Yes, I would express an opinion on it. I think it served a purpose, and I don't think anyone has been hurt too much as a result of it, but it has limitations. We are in financial difficulty, and the reason for that is that the bulk sale of televisions and coverage has been pretty well completed, or 80 per cent completed, and that revenue now has gone, or reasonably so, and it isn't any longer the large amount of revenue we had before. I am not opposed to it. I think it served a very useful purpose, as a

matter of fact.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But you feel from now on the financing of CBC should be done by government grants?

MR. HAMILTON: It has to be, we feel, in order to take a look at the future and plan and prepare for the future.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the point on the earmarked excise tax that it has no relationship to the legitimate needs of the CBC, that the number of sets you happen to sell with a 15 per cent tax on them has not necessarily any relationship at all to the amount of money that could properly be devoted by the state to this purpose?

MR. HAMILTON: That is true.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if that is the case, it could conceivably work in both cases: it may be that in the early surge of sales there was too much tax money funnelled off in this way.

MR. JENOVES: It was painless extraction.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am thinking of the effect this could have, or could have had on the administration of the CBC.

MR. HAMILTON: I think it came for the CBC at an unfortunate time, in that they got revenue from a source which allowed them to expand in the way they did, and I am wondering if it was a good thing they did expand as quickly and rapidly as they did. Indeed, if they are going to continue to expand I think some other source of revenue is going to have to be made available.

MR. COYNE: Progressing just to the bottom of page 5, where you comment on television news broadcasts, you say that the international and local news are out of proportion and there should be more local news. Isn't the CBC with its national commitments inevitably bound, perhaps, to over-emphasize national and international matters rather than local matters, and isn't it probably the legitimate function of the local community stations to look after local requirements of that nature?

THE CHAIRMAN: He is talking about television news broadcasts here.

MR. COYNE: Well, perhaps I can put it this way: Where you have a CBC station and only a CBC station it will concentrate -- of necessity concentrate -- on national matters?

MR. HAMILTON: Let me answer your question this way: We agree that, by its very nature, they are more prone to deal with national and international problems and some of the people turn to the CBC for the eleven o'clock news because of the fact that it carries predominantly international affairs. We say that is fine, and we agree with that. We think it should be continued. But what we think is that the CBC have to realize that, where they have a station in the locality, to some degree it has to serve that locality.

Our approach to this thing is that the people in the locality should continue to press for more local news at times different from the

international news coverage. I think there are many programmes on CBLT which I, as a person, could forget, and put in local news coverage.

THE CHAIRMAN: That issue is slightly different from what it is in the brief. You are suggesting, in addition to the additional national and international coverage, a function of CBC television in local news at different times.

MR. HAMILTON: That is right. The national news coverage on CBLT is out of all proportion to any local news we get. We say that there should be local news, and have the eleven o'clock news for national or international affairs.

MR. COYNE: Turning now to page 8, if you will, where you say:

"Our chief complaint in the field of radio is primarily with the private stations. As we have stated before, their chief concern is profits and they have little if any concern about community affairs, or the development of Canadian talent."

Some of the private stations that have appeared before us have emphasized the fact that they must build up and maintain their audiences. They must provide broadcast fare that will attract listeners otherwise -- well, their profits suffer, and in the extreme, they are going out of business.

Now, if a private station is only successful if it is able to provide fare that attracts a large audience is it still fair to say that they don't concern themselves with community affairs, with the

interests -- the community interests if you like -- of the audience that, by its very nature, it has to serve?

MR. HAMILTON: Well, as a part of a nationally owned system we agree that they are out of proportion now -- in their own stated importance, at least; that they feel that they are somewhat separate and apart from the national body.

But is it not part of the regulations that the private stations are to develop (a) Canadian talent and (b) to at least turn back into the community in the way of developing -- not only developing talent, but in participating in community affairs -- some portion of the moneys or profits they take out of the community? I suggest that if the financial statements of the Toronto and all radio stations were made available and made public each year, and the amount of money that they contribute back into the community in the way of community services, were analysed and set against one another you would find it was very little contribution that they had made to the community compared with what they took out.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are limiting your views and opinion to the Toronto area?

MR. HAMILTON: Yes. That is our brief here.

THE CHAIRMAN: In some of the sections where we have been there has been evidence of substantial community value, if you like, in the performance of private stations.

MR. HAMILTON: True; but we are dealing here with Toronto and area as we see it.

MR. COYNE: These are all my questions, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: I don't know whether you were here this morning, or your colleagues, but we had two witnesses, one a spokesman for the Progressive-Conservative Student Federation and the other the spokesman for the Television Set Owners' Association. Both contended that there was a sizeable body of opinion here in favour of seeing, or hearing, American-produced programmes. In fact, one went so far as to say that eighty per cent of the public were for that in this area; and they wanted a greater freedom of choice. That implies that they want to see more and more American programmes.

This afternoon one of the reasons -- you gave us a number of reasons -- why you and the Labour Councils were opposed to the granting of another channel to private operators, and one of the reasons you advanced was that you feared that it would lead to a greater infiltration of American programmes.

Could you tell us what is really the motivation behind your attitude? Is it strictly patriotic, or nationalistic, or is it economic? By that I mean do you feel it would take some job away from Canadians, or is it patriotic? Will you tell us something of your views on that matter?

MR. HAMILTON: Well, I would answer that this way: You said that I said in my remarks that

I felt that the opening of another station here in Toronto would necessitate bringing in more American programmes. I don't think I suggested that. I don't think I said that. What I did say was that if there were a private station opened in the Toronto area, that was to be opened on the basis of competition, it would of necessity have to go to the American networks to provide direct competition. But if another television private station were opened it didn't follow.

(1) I don't think there is any necessity for another station here in Toronto, because all of those things that the people say they want, or those people who spoke this morning -- they can get it by turning the dial to either of the Buffalo stations which cover both the networks; and it is a matter of flicking your dial.

Secondly, I have to say that we are motivated firstly by patriotism, but most of our motivation -- I will be very honest with you -- is a selfish one -- because the CBC have employed our people at fair rates of pay, and they have signed agreements with us. We have had our squabbles and our fights, as we always have, but they have developed Canadian talent, and they employ an awful lot of our people here in Canada; and I say that is as it should be. The private radio stations and those who are seemingly the people who are talking about the granting of television outlets have not indicated in any way -- at least in this particular area -- that

they are prepared to do the same sort of thing. So partly it is patriotic and partly a bit selfish, if that is what you call selfish.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps arising from that there is one point on which I am interested in your views. Can you tell us how we can set up the conflicting evidence we seem to get? We get a most diversified opinion as to the degree to which CBC programmes are acceptable, and, in fact, listened to by the people residing in this area. We have had those who speak in very high terms of the programmes, which seems to indicate that they are listening to them, and you have others, as Mr. Turcotte mentioned, who say that not twenty per cent of the people listen to CBC.

Now, have you any views -- from your membership -- as to the degree to which CBC is not just a good thing from your point of view but is, in fact, being listened to and used?

MR. HAMILTON: I haven't the statistics or the data on coverage as to what the ratio of listening is to any particular programme, or anything like that, but I think I would venture to guess -- and it is an opinion, for what it is worth -- I think that there are programmes which are religiously watched and listened to in the Toronto area. For instance, I think the news at eleven o'clock has got about as good coverage as any other coverage has at that particular time. The hockey match on Saturday night -- I think there is no other programme could have that coverage. So if you take the whole gamut of

programming, CBLT-wise and Buffalo-wise, my own opinion would be that we would collar pretty well one-third of the listening audience in the Toronto area over a given length of time.

Of course, when some programmes like the "\$64,000 Question," or something comes over the American network -- which is a well known, popular programme -- well, we drop audiences and lose audiences.

In regard to public affairs, the people in the plant and the people we deal with from day to day, the indication is -- I have been one or two times on television, and I go into the plants afterwards, and I am rather surprised at the number of people who come up and say that they have watched it -- the Public Affairs programme; and I think we get a reasonably good audience. . . . As we say in the brief, the CBC, over the past year at least in some of the production numbers, has been improved tremendously. I am in touch with the listening audience

THE CHAIRMAN: It is that kind of personal contact report that I was really wanting to get from you, because you are speaking from a position where you see quite a number of people.

Just, perhaps, along that same line -- and this is not in any way intended to raise a criticism or question on your brief -- but you do say that you have 110,000 members in your various affiliated organizations. To what extent do the opinions expressed in your brief represent the

conscious opinion of a substantial number of those? To what extent has it been discussed? Have you gone about getting their views and opinions?

MR. HAMILTON: We have, over many years, at our national, at our provincial, at our Toronto and at our local levels of labour activity, at our conventions and our discussions and councils and that sort of thing, many times discussed the CBC and all the arrangements and activities of the CBC, and I have to say to you that the criticism of the CBC in our membership is very, very small. We have overwhelming support of the CBC. Of course, where you have the large membership that we have you do get some criticism, but it is very, very insignificant. Any criticism that we have of the CBC -- you may get an individual criticism that "I wanted to watch such and such a programme and I couldn't see it," but, generally speaking, the labour movement are in complete agreement with the submission that we have made to you here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me ask you one thing: Have you, at previous types of inquiries, parliamentary committees or the Massey Commission, or at any of these things, put in briefs similar in content to this brief?

MR. HAMILTON: At local level, no, but at the national level we always deal through our national office in these things.

THE CHAIRMAN: But what I am getting at is whether, having put in your brief, you have had

a reaction from your membership on the brief?

MR. HAMILTON: Mr. Archer draws to my attention that we could file with you a resolution which pretty well substantiates that. It was passed at our recent merger in Toronto, with some sixteen hundred and some odd delegates in attendance, and this resolution is pretty well in accord and was passed unanimously at our convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: What I am trying to do is not to cast any doubt on your authority to speak, but we realize that it is perfectly obvious that in any large organization with 110,000 members there isn't going to be complete unanimity.

MR. HAMILTON: As you very well know, Mr. Chairman, where you have an organization of 110,000 members they don't speak with one voice.

THE CHAIRMAN: But what I am trying to get at is that there has to be a certain amount of latitude, and we are anxious to know how we get at the weight of your representations.

MR. HAMILTON: Let me say this to you, that there is more democracy in our council meetings than in any other aspect of our association. If you attended one of our meetings you will find out that there is more democracy practised in our council meetings than in any other meeting you will find in the country.

THE CHAIRMAN: And this issue of radio and television has been discussed?

MR. HAMILTON: Yes, many times, definitely -- on many occasions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, I had one other question that I wanted to ask you, and that is on the point about public relations by the CBC, which is really, perhaps, the point on which you are most critical of the CBC, as I think you state.

Isn't there a very real problem if a government board starts sort of beating its own drum?

MR. COTTERILL: Bob Saunders did a good job for the Hydro.

MR. HAMILTON: And I don't think he did anybody any harm.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Don't you think the CBC is inhibited by reason of being a regulatory board?

MR. COTTERILL: They are also administrative.

MR. HAMILTON: I don't think so.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But talking on the one point, as the regulatory ---

MR. COTTERILL: They may be inhibited, but we are unsure of the reason.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you don't feel that this is a valid inhibition. You think, being a government-owned board, being a special board ---

MR. COTTERILL: The Ontario Hydro Board was a regulatory board over municipal hydro. The analogy isn't on all fours, but they were in the same position, and it didn't stop Bob Saunders beating the drum about the virtues of the Ontario Hydro; and I don't see why the CBC shouldn't do the same.

MR. HAMILTON: The point is this, Mr.

Chairman, that if the people of Canada and our members in Canada knew the real problems of operating and trying to put together a programme, in trying to get a programme on the air as well as they possibly can, I think they would be much more tolerant than they are. You hear everybody attacking and abusing CBC, and the CBC does nothing about it. The thing gets to some stage where you must defend yourself.

THE CHAIRMAN: You think that being a public board is no reason why they shouldn't deal in public relations?

MR. HAMILTON: Not at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will hear what Mr. Dunton has to say about that when we have him in September.

MR. HAMILTON: I will try to be at his hearing.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is one question further that I had noted down. You talk about your TV-radio centre. It has been suggested to us -- the point you mention particularly came out -- the enormous cost of trucking and storage which is added to the production costs. Where we got it I don't know, but somebody did suggest that the old idea that TV and radio had to be down in the centre of the city was no longer true, and that you could move out to the outskirts where there was plenty of land and build a more temporary type of building which would not be permitted under building regulations in town, for storage purposes and the like.

Do you think that is the way that this

television-radio centre would probably develop?

MR. HAMILTON: I would say this -- and it is a personal opinion again -- that I don't think we would have any objection to it moving out where it could expand and grow in that way. I don't favour that term you used -- "temporary" -- because we think it should be very permanent.

THE CHAIRMAN: I meant the type of construction -- building -- which could be perfectly valid if out in the outskirts, for storing purposes, which you can't use in town.

MR. HAMILTON: It may be a solution that we wouldn't be averse to.

THE CHAIRMAN: But, specifically, you haven't gone into that question very particularly?

MR. HAMILTON: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, gentlemen.

MR. HAMILTON: I want to thank you and the members of the Commission for the hearing you have given us.

THE CHAIRMAN: You might send along that resolution for me, if you will.

MR. HAMILTON: Yes.

---A short recess was taken.

SUBMISSION OF THE CANADIAN WIRE SERVICE
GUILD

THE CHAIRMAN: Our next brief is The Canadian Wire Service Guild, Mr. Reilly and Mr. Calder are here to present that brief. We will begin by marking your brief Exhibit 103.

EXHIBIT NO. 103: Brief of the Canadian Wire Service Guild.

MR. REILLY: Mr. Chairman, I am proceeding on the information I have received that the Commissioners would rather hear a brief summary of the brief. Ours is a very brief brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is entirely up to you, whatever you think is the most effective means of presenting it. If you would rather read it, do so, but if you would rather summarize it, do that.

MR. REILLY: First of all, I would like to introduce the organization; the Canadian Wire Service Guild represents the news service employees of the CBC, about 120 of them. They gather and write the news you hear and see on CBC radio and television. Here, I might add, ours are only the views of our members and do not exactly reflect the views of the American Union of which we are a member.

THE CHAIRMAN: They are views of yours?

MR. REILLY: Yes, and the Guild concurs in the principle, the Guild concurs in the idea that a public broadcasting system is essential to Canada's life. The Guild believes that, in

terms of its statutory obligations under the Broadcasting Act, the CBC news service has served Canada well. It has established an enviable position in the news service field throughout the world.

My first heading has to do with the gathering of news and the news service field. Now, to run a news gathering operation you must have reporters and we think the reporters must be experienced, as well trained as the desk men who edit and write. At the present time camera men are being used in repertorial service and we think they are not trained to perform these duties satisfactorily. We contend reporters should be assigned to go with camera men to gather all the news, such as is the prevailing practice in most TV stations at present.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you thinking there when you are talking about news gathering, are you talking about news gathering in the local area?

MR. REILLY: Well, most of our news gathering has been in the local area, but I should enlarge on that a little later on. We had hoped to have with us this afternoon a camera man who has recently been sent on a foreign assignment by the CBC who can elaborate further. He is not here as yet and we will have to proceed without him.

The next issue on which I would like to touch is the report by a previous Royal Commission, that on Arts, Letters and Sciences in Canada, which, as I have said in the brief, says this:

"Although the Canadian Press,

through its bureaux in New York, Washington and London, gives special attention to Canadian interests in those areas, we in Canada are largely dependent on foreign news services designed primarily to serve the United States. For this there appears to be no remedy, unless the newspapers supporting the Canadian Press judge that they can and should enlarge their news gathering services abroad; probably few Canadians are aware that the news of the world that comes to them is largely gathered and written by Americans for Americans ---"

We think there is one clear remedy for this and that is the expansion of the CBC news service. As I have just mentioned, the Corporation has in the past recognized the need for this or for correspondents in foreign capitals, and now have correspondents in London, Paris, Washington and the United Nations headquarters in New York. More recently the service has sent reporters to the Middle East and Algeria. We think, as a result of what we have heard in wire service dispatches and what we have been told by one of the men who made this trip, Canadians are held in very high esteem practically all over the world, and we think Canada as a country has a job to do as an interpreter and has the opportunity to do it.

We have in the field of news the organization, the best people to do the job is the CBC news service.

The next topic on which I would like to touch is finance. The National Television News Service is still developing and we think that if given adequate financing the service will provide the Canadian television audience with news as reliable and accurate as are being provided on the radio news service, which has been known for many years as a reliable source of information. We do not think the development of television should be allowed to impair the quality of the radio news service in any way. Touching on the matter of administration, at the present time the chief editor who is responsible for the integration of the news service is responsible to the director of programmes, and we suggest as a means of maintaining at least the present standards of the CBC news service consideration might be given to the appointment of a director of news who would be directly responsible to the general manager.

In conclusion, we think the Canadian public should continue to expect and get the best possible CBC news service, and to assure this end we say that the salaries of the CBC men should be at least as good as any in Canadian journalism. We are now prepared to answer any questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to add anything to this, Mr. Calder?

MR. CALDER: I do not think so. If you wish us to enlarge on the question of assigning

camera men to duty, we had hoped that the camera man who accompanied Mr. Henderson to the Middle East and Cyprus would be here, but he is a free lance man and is pretty busy. He did point out to us, when they first went to Cyprus, they were taken for Englishmen and they were very unwelcome, but as soon as they found out they were Canadians they were given all sorts of cooperation in carrying out their assignment. And the same was largely true in the Middle East. At the present time we have a free lance camera man and a CBC correspondant in Algeria, and we do not know what their experience has been but we do know they have run into difficulties that all newsmen are running into in Algeria, difficulties of censorship and so on. We would like to be able to present to you some report of their reception there compared to that of other newsmen.

Getting back to the national field or the local field, the assignment of camera men to cover stories applies mostly to the regional news rooms in Canada. We can speak of Toronto specifically, where the so-called assignment editors in TV news are pretty well kept to the office except in the case of a few reports when they do interviews. Outside of this, the situation is such that there just are not reporters available to accompany camera men. This criticism stems partly from the camera men themselves who feel that they have enough to do in getting their equipment and setting up their equipment to cover the story without obtaining

information, they would like some direction in addition from a trained newsmen, although some of them have excellent news sense themselves.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Mr. Calder, are these camera men members of your organization?

MR. CALDER: No, they are not; they may belong to an organization, a labour organization, but that does not affect their relationship to the news service. They work under a private contract with the news service, they are private contractors in that respect.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: In the case of the camera man accompanying the CBC correspondent in Algeria, does he have a specific contract with the CBC to cover a certain assignment and then he is free again?

MR. REILLY: He is not employed by the CBC, he is an accredited camera man. In this particular case he worked with the CBC for a while, then he went to Rome and became a free lance camera man, bought his own equipment; he sent back to us some samples of his work and like any other camera man in the world he was set up as an accredited camera man with the CBC. If the CBC wanted this man to do a particular assignment or they have had an opportunity arising in his area they would ask him to do it, pay him the royalty plus his expenses. He is not a CBC employee but an accredited camera man.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: He does specific

jobs on request?

MR. CALDER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: And he sells some of his work to other places as well?

MR. CALDER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Completely free lance but doing specific jobs for the CBC as well?

MR. CALDER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Are there others in that field or is this a specific case?

MR. CALDER: No, under the present circumstances most of the camera men are free lance; even in Canada we have accredited camera men in many parts of Canada where there are not CBC news rooms. We also have an accredited camera man in Ceylon, India and other parts of the world. They are people who in most cases have got in touch with the CBC and asked for assignments.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: When you say "we" you do not mean your Guild?

MR. REILLY: No, the news service.

THE CHAIRMAN: The CBC news service?

MR. CALDER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. de Grandpre, have you some questions?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Reilly, I think you mentioned that your Guild comprises approximately 120 members; is that correct?

MR. REILLY: Yes, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Am I right in assuming

that they are largely located in Montreal and Toronto?

MR. REILLY: About fifty per cent in Montreal and Toronto; the other is divided among Vancouver, Winnipeg, Halifax, Saint Johns, Newfoundland, Ottawa and Windsor, Ontario.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And these include what you call the news gathering people and the editing?

MR. REILLY: Well, I should perhaps enlarge on that. There are no people, outside of one, specifically designated as a reporter. News gathering can and sometimes does vary in the day's work, for the most part these people are editors who write news bulletins, both radio and TV, from other sources of material.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, you have given us some percentages about the radio audience which had declined by 53 per cent because of TV, while the radio audience had dropped by only 22 per cent for the National News Bulletin?

MR. REILLY: Yes, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, it has been mentioned to us out West that the news bulletins of the private stations were listened to more often than the CBC news bulletins, because they had more local interest, and that the news bulletin of the CBC remained on the national and international level. Already some discussion about this has been had today when the labour representatives indicated that they felt the CBC news bulletins were concentrated on national and international news and

they were not paying enough attention to local news. Could you comment on this situation?

MR. REILLY: Yes, but, of course, since we have not touched on it in the brief this is fairly personal, but I think in any country you will find a certain proportion of your population interested in events of national and international scope, whereas in another part they will be interested in murders, fires, all kinds of mayhem, and if the latter happens to be greater than the former there is nothing CBC news can do about it, really.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But is there any impediment to your giving local bulletins at different times during the day?

MR. REILLY: Oh, no, sir.

MR. CALDER: Lack of money.

MR. REILLY: However, we do in some locations provide local bulletins, we do not do it on as large a scale as a number of people would perhaps like us to do it but in Toronto, for instance, the National news bulletin and other bulletins than Trans-Canada network and largely on station CBL, those are radio bulletins dealing mainly with national and international news with the exception of regional bulletins which deal largely with Ontario news. On station CJBC we have three times -- about six times during the day -- bulletins which will contain top national and international stories and also contain top local news stories.

THE CHAIRMAN: How do these local items of

news get to you and your confreres for writing into this?

MR. REILLY: Well, we subscribe to the news service of British United Press, the Canadian Press; we get most of it from them.

THE CHAIRMAN: My point is, the job of picking up local news has got to be done in the main through the ordinary wire services?

MR. REILLY: Yes, plus telephone calls and so on.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you really have not got a local news gathering agency of your own?

MR. REILLY: Not in radio.

THE CHAIRMAN: Or in television?

MR. REILLY: We do in Toronto and all the TV production centres, we have a certain amount of local news gathering, in fact, a great deal of it now. There is a dispute and criticism about local news and, for instance, the news bulletin carried on TV at 6.45, on CBLT, there is a five-minute portion set aside for local news.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Is there no interchange of news between television and radio?

MR. REILLY: Well, we subscribe to the same services. If one department on television, the news department, were to stumble on a news break that would not in the ordinary course of events be carried on news service wires, I would deem it part of the job to get in touch with radio desk immediately.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I take it you feel it is your responsibility to carry more national and international news because you are carrying on a national service; is that the reason, or is it simply there is a lack of funds?

MR. REILLY: I think the way the CBC news has gone into local coverage, it has done so a great many times under some kind of pressure from local groups who have no other way of doing it.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is precisely my point, if you want to achieve the ultimate results that you want to reach, namely a national coverage, if you do not interest the listeners to a point where they will tune in on the international news, then you will not achieve the purpose that you had in mind. Is there not a way of balancing the diet to such a point that you will make a broth that will be attractive to a larger group of listeners?

MR. REILLY: Well, here we are dealing in the brief with things on a national scope, that poses a question of technicalities there since, if you, for instance, have a bulletin originating in Toronto, the national news bulletin does try to concern itself with national and international news as well as local news, it would be virtually impossible, since if you have a local item originating in Saint John's, Newfoundland, people in Vancouver turn off their radios, they do not care. The only thing that is of interest to every audience is national and international news, that is of interest

to everyone.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wonder if there is a difference between radio and television, at least at its present stage of radio news; you apparently are making the case that the national news service on radio is something that is better to be national and international in the main, and leaving the local news coverage to the local radio stations. Now, in television, just to complete the question, where at the moment you only have one system, the case might be, the people who were here just before you say that there ought to be in the time available not taken up by the national programmes some attention given to local news coverage in television news.

MR. REILLY: I think perhaps I had better re-define the local news and international news. The CBC or any other reputable news agency will never draw the line down the middle and say this is national, international or local. If it is news it really boils down to the man on the desk, but there is generally something about a story that marks it either wide interest or not. I think that local news under the present set-up can best be handled by private outlets because they are in scope local operators, CBC news service is not; that again is my position.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are talking about radio?

MR. REILLY: And television as well. Perhaps I had better go back, because we have no full microwave network, but when that comes it will be

an entirely different thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Even when it does, as long as the single station policy is in, whatever news cast it has to go on that station, whether it is publicly or privately owned?

MR. REILLY: That policy is now ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Did I hear you state a moment ago that at the present time on the Toronto television station, which is a CBC operated one, that there is a television local news that is not carried nationally?

MR. REILLY: Yes, that is right. It is not marked, it is not set aside at a special time, and the way it works it is the last one-third of the evening news bulletin, stations on the microwave network, that is Ottawa and Montreal, drop off to give regional news and Toronto feeds regional news to Ontario.

MR. CALDER: If I might speak to that, in an informal and private conversation with a member of management the other day, and I think this has been made clear at several meetings too, they would like to give greater concern, they have expressed to me, to local coverage of news, but they feel that the present number of editors they are able to employ under the present budget, that all these people are better serving the national function of a news service and it would entail added expenditure in TV that they are not prepared to meet. This is just an opinion expressed to me.

THE CHAIRMAN: It undoubtedly means added expense, more news than you are getting now; the net result is added expenditure and that is something we would have to look at.

MR. de GRANDPRE: On page 2 of your brief you say in the second paragraph:

"Not only has it involved the
use of new techniques and new talents,
but it has required the service to
extend its operations to include
certain basic functions . . ."

When you refer to "new techniques" are you only referring to the news-gathering operation that you refer to in your brief and the fact that you have to send camera men on the road to get the news, or do you refer to something else?

MR. REILLY: No, something else, sir. There is coming with television, in my view, and I think the majority of opinion, a new type of newsman who is familiar -- not only basically a newsman, but also familiar with the techniques of film writing which is again an entirely different type of writing from radio writing in details and presentation, studio presentation, it is quite a step from one to the other, and you must acquire new techniques; that is, you are kind of jack of all trades and master of very few of them but you must know them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is this something like the producer newsman, like the producer professor we had this morning?

MR. REILLY: I would not like to get into that, but in order to be useful in a television news set-up he must know a little bit about everyone else's job and this sometimes requires a lifetime of training, just as the news profession requires it.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You refer to the editing of the film?

MR. REILLY: No, that is a different function.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Altogether different?

MR. REILLY: Well, take a personal example; I have on occasion had to, in effect, be a film director. Now, men study for years to be film directors and on occasion CBC newsmen have had to pick this up rather quickly in order to do the job.

THE CHAIRMAN: Am I getting your thought if I put it this way, that you are suggesting in order to put news on television the whole television technique has to be at least known to the man who is gathering that news so he can pick and choose the kind of news which will go best on television?

MR. REILLY: That is right.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, there has been a lot of talk about the interference of government bodies with the news supplied by CBC, and you probably are the closest persons to this problem, and I would like to have your comments on this particular point.

MR. REILLY: Well, are you referring to a specific comment?

MR. de GRANDPRE: I am not referring to anything specifically, I would like to know in a

general way whether as newsmen you can gather the news which you feel in your opinion is the best news to be broadcast?

MR. REILLY: Most certainly.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Or whether your work is hampered by some interference by somebody who is not a newsman?

MR. REILLY: No, sir, at least, it has never been my experience that anyone interfered with me at all other than day to day supervision, editing, but in my opinion no news stories have been suppressed or published at the behest of anyone at all for that matter -- even the head of the news department. News is news, and practically everyone can judge it, and I know of no attempt to suppress news.

THE CHAIRMAN: To be specific, this applies to officers and directors of the CBC, it applies equally to politicians, members of government, members of cabinet, members of the opposition, anybody?

MR. REILLY: In fact, if I might enter a personal observation, on entering the CBC news service some years ago I was astounded at the atmosphere of freedom. This is not, if I might again give a personal observation, the rule of thumb in private organizations.

MR. CALDER: If I might make an observation, subsequent to news bulletins there are inquiries made from time to time possibly about the choice of language; I am saying "subsequent" to

news bulletins there are inquiries from time to time, sometimes from political leaders, about the script of a new broadcast, and there are questions on possibly the balance of coverage on certain matters, and it has been my personal experience that the position is, there is more worry about the editors in the news room than the government; we are much more sensitive to that kind of inquiry than the Government inquiry. That is just a personal observation.

-

-

-

(Page 2486 follows)

-

-

MR. de GRANDPRE: There is no basis, then, for this fear of thought control ---

MR. CALDER: Emphatically no.

MR. de GRANDPRE: -- that we have read about and heard about. Now, you mention in your brief that the CBC distributes news films to at least twelve other countries. I don't know if the other members of the Commission are familiar with this aspect of your news coverage, but it was news to me and I would like to get more information on this aspect of it.

MR. REILLY: I couldn't name the countries; I could name some of them, but there is an exchange between them. We have set up a syndication department. Television systems in other countries exchange film with us, as I understand it. I am not sure to what extent CBC benefits from that exchange, but I do know film is constantly being shipped abroad to, for example, German television and Italian television, and to American networks.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Are they shipped on request?

MR. REILLY: It depends on the network involved. With the American networks they must be requested. In the case of overseas, in most cases the syndication editor decides whether an item is of the type that might be desired by a television system abroad. By that I don't mean necessarily the news story. In the main I believe news features are in demand; film items that might be said to give people abroad a closer look at what Canadians

are like.

MR. de GRANDPRE: They are more of the general information type than actual day to day news?

MR. REILLY: Oh, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: More of a documentary film -- not strictly that?

MR. REILLY: You would call them news features, I would think.

MR. CALDER: Every week the European networks cable us offers of films, and we check their list and see if there is anything there that is interesting. Sometimes the wording of the cable is so succinct it is difficult to tell. We accept these films from the foreign networks and, naturally, we keep in much closer touch with the American networks because we can call them on the telephone. Usually they are more interested in spot coverage -- such subjects as quintuplets and crashing aeroplanes, but the European networks are more interested in the feature type of film.

MR. de GRANDPRE: In the fourth paragraph of page 2 of the brief you say:

"This is an outstanding example of a type of basic operation that makes a re-assessment and redefinition of the functions of the CBC news service urgently necessary."

If you want this Commission to make a reassessment and redefinition I think you should give us more material on which we can work because, as I understand

your brief, there was only the particular point of news gathering and expansion of correspondents abroad. Do you have any other thoughts on this reassessment and redefinition of functions?

MR. CALDER: Those were the points.

MR. de GRANDPRE: These were the only two points you had in mind?

MR. CALDER: Yes, we feel it is a major change in the output and scope.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, a last question: Do you feel the function of chief editor should be renamed or reshaped and that there should be a director of news directly responsible to the general manager? When we were studying the outline of the management of the CBC it was brought to our attention that there are at least eight or nine departments already reporting to the General Manager, if not more, and it was thought that it was not good management policy to have too many persons reporting to the General Manager. I see that you take quite a different attitude and you would like to add another person reporting to the General Manager. One of the reasons given is that you feel it would prevent fluctuations in the programming budget.

MR. REILLY: No, if there were fluctuations---

MR. de GRANDPRE: ". . . there would be less possibility of the service becoming subject to any fluctuations in the programming budget." That is how you put it in your brief. Is this a necessary conclusion of the change you suggest?

MR. REILLY: I think implicit in the change is the idea that if the director of news, or the position were established, news would then become a separate department of the CBC, and therefore would operate with its own budget completely outside and completely unaffected by any, as we say, fluctuations in the programming budget.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But wouldn't the director of music feel the same way, and then the director of theatre feel the same way?

MR. REILLY: Quite so.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And then you would have a flood of services reporting directly to the general manager?

MR. REILLY: Yes, but the point of the whole brief is that the news service is a highly important service of the CBC and, we submit, the most important one, and while we will not say we don't care what happens to the drama department or the music department, we don't feel the fortunes of the news service should be allowed to rest on how much money those departments need.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Your injection of this thought is with a view to your being allotted a bigger share of the spending budget?

MR. REILLY: Well, we make that point elsewhere.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, is there any other point in this that is worth considering? There is the point as to straight administration, and the

problem of having too many people with access to the general manager to the extent that you either kill him or he doesn't know how to get around all the bases. Somewhere the point was made to me, and it may have been in a private discussion, that news was an essential feature of any broadcasting system, and that the mere reporting of news was not enough; that it was something which was basic, but had to be tied into a whole host of other things in the nature of interpretations of the news, panel discussions, general commentaries, and so forth -- Talks Departments, and the like -- all sort of funnelling out from the basic news function. If there is anything in that suggestion, then isn't there something to be said for news being part of the general programming of the organization rather than being isolated and insulated somewhere else?

MR. REILLY: As you yourself said, all the functions such as panel discussions and talks funnel out from the news. We feel if any change or any grouping together is made, the news service ought to be the centre of that funnel rather than ---

THE CHAIRMAN: I am wondering if this is central to the overall programming of a broadcasting service and if there are many other things dependent upon it then as a matter of organization isn't there something to be said for having the director of programmes responsible for the news, so that even if you had a director of news he would respond not to the general manager but to the director of

programmes? Is the mere budgetary point you have made in order to protect your budget sufficient to overweigh this organization point?

MR. REILLY: We have no desire to flood the general manager with extra reports if some other system can be devised which will still leave the news system independent of fluctuating budgets elsewhere; that will certainly suit our purposes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know that any service or any branch of any service can be completely independent of fluctuating budgets, because if we run into bad times everybody is going to be affected.

MR. REILLY: Well, more independent than at present.

MR. CALDER: I think, sir, possibly the type of organization to which you are referring has applied for a good many years in the BBC. In radio this has not been the case in the CBC. There is one director responsible for news and talks and public affairs and programmes of comment and so on, and the CBC is organized somewhat differently. Our feeling on this point is that in television coverage, while we may to some extent be infringing on the areas of talks on public affairs, a good number of our items on television are essentially items of background news owing to the fact film takes some time to transport from one part of the world to another, and consequently a substantial part of the news time is allotted to background information; in this sense, that we are moving into the

area which we did not occupy before, except to some extent in News Roundup where news feature items were used, but in this backgrounding of information, for instance, Mr. Henderson's trip to the Middle East, there is not an attempt to cover spot news. It is an attempt on the part of the news service to background as clearly and lucidly and vividly as possible the news of the day -- not all news, possibly -- it may be news of that day and probably will be, but that is one of the reasons we feel the news service itself is embracing a larger function within the Corporation now, and possibly moving slowly into the area of talks on public affairs.

THE CHAIRMAN: If it is, then I would, myself, question the wisdom of insulating the news from these broader activities which you may do by this suggested method of having the director of news responsible for news and news only direct to the general manager -- apart from his busy day.

MR. CALDER: There is a good deal of co-operation now from the various departments: Talks on Public Affairs call on us for films at times and suggestions.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is all, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you both very much. I think we can take it that the point you wanted the photographer to speak on is one that is a general matter of opinion about Canada's reception in other countries.

MR. CALDER: I think he may have arrived by now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if possible, we will take him later, but, at any rate, we have got his point.

- - - - -

SUBMISSION OF ONTARIO LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
CHILDREN'S SECTION

THE CHAIRMAN: We have two more briefs, reasonably short in length, one by the Ontario Library Association, Children's Section. Miss Jean Thomson?

MISS THOMSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will mark your brief as Exhibit No. 104.

EXHIBIT NO. 104: Brief of Ontario Library Association, Children's Section.

THE CHAIRMAN: Miss Thomson, you have someone with you?

MISS THOMSON: Yes, Miss Whiteman, the Chairman of the Children's Section.

THE CHAIRMAN: Miss Whiteman, thank you for coming. Will you outline the brief to us, or, if you prefer, read it.

MISS THOMSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps as it is a very short brief, the simplest

way would be to read it through.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well.

MISS THOMSON: It is from the Children's Section of the Library Association. I believe this Commission is hearing a brief from the Canadian Library Association later on this week, so we have confined ourselves entirely in this one to the matter of the relation between children's radio and television programmes and children's reading.

"The public has been invited to comment on its views in regard to radio and television broadcasting in Canada. As children's librarians, the group submitting this brief, we are primarily concerned with material provided in book form, but we are also interested in the dissemination of ideas to young people, no matter what form this distribution takes. It is from this point of view that we have studied the radio and television programmes produced for children by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and have formed certain opinions which may have some bearing on the study that is being undertaken by the Royal Commission on Broadcasting.

"Radio and television can do many things that books cannot do. They can reach an enormous audience who have never read a book. They can stimulate the interest of their audience and arouse its curiosity to pursue these interest further. They can create new

readers. This is particularly true as regards children's audiences. Time and again we have observed the effect that a stimulating programme has on a young audience. The ready response of children to what appeals to them, their enthusiasm, their lack of preconceived ideas as to what a programme should be, offer a challenging opportunity to anyone in a position to provide entertainment (in its broadest sense) to children.

"The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as a government organization, supported by public funds is in an enviable position to provide children in all parts of Canada, through its national network and through its local outlets, with programmes that are stimulating in content and original in form of presentation.

"In planning their children's programmes producers need not be hampered by sponsors who influence the contents of their presentations. This is an obvious advantage at the outset, for it is the exceptional sponsor who does not wish, in some way, to direct his audience toward a certain goal. He may have some small interest in entertaining children, but his main object is to reach the parents through the children, either by means of advertising techniques or by offering children programmes which purport to be for them, but which in reality are aiming at the adult audience as

as well. The result of this type of programme is lack of sincerity. The subject may be for children, but the treatment, with its cynical humour or its double entendres, makes it unsuitable entertainment for children.

"To achieve their full response, children's programmes must be planned for children, treated in a manner that is comprehensible to them, and command their respect. Children are not miniature adults, and adult humour, adult ideas simplified and watered-down, do not provide suitable children's entertainment. They have their own sense of humour and drama, their own standards of entertainment. Their programmes require an entirely separate approach to those planned for adults if good programmes for children are to be achieved.

"The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has a splendid opportunity -- both on the national and local level -- to offer children programmes suitable to their interests and capabilities, unhampered by outside influences of an undesirable nature. It is obvious that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is aware of this opportunity, as a few programmes of high calibre are available across the country. There is need for more of these programmes, planned for different age groups of children and scaled to the level of their understanding, experience, and interest.

"These programmes require not only to be of high quality, they also need the continued support of the producer to allow time for them to become established. Such programmes take time to make their influence felt, and their value cannot necessarily be judged by the quick popular response that is given to one with more superficial and readily assessed appeal. It takes time to find its audience and to win its confidence. But once that has been achieved its effects are more lasting.

"A systematic plan of publicity is essential to acquaint the public with information about these programmes, either through paid publicity or by soliciting the support of organizations concerned with children's welfare. There is much evidence that parents, teachers, librarians, and anyone whose work is with boys and girls, would welcome information of this sort if it was readily available to them. These people realize that children need direction in regard to choosing their radio and television programmes in the same way as they do in their choice of books.

"In conclusion, we would like to offer a few specific recommendations to be considered by those responsible for planning children's radio and television programmes.

1. That more time be given to presentation of those children's classics which are of

universal appeal to boys and girls. The serial versions of *The Wind in the Willows*, *Alice in Wonderland* and *Winnie-the-Pooh*, rebroadcast by CBC from BBC are instances of the type of programme we have in mind.

2. The continuation of *Cuckoo Clock House*, which introduces children to good books and invites them to explore further for themselves.
3. The use of more story-telling material on both radio and television by story tellers of the quality that was so ably demonstrated by the *Sleepy Time Story Teller*.
4. The sustained support of a television programme for children similar in content to that of *Cuckoo Clock House*. *Hidden Pages* was removed before it had had time to find its audience.
5. Some good picture books for younger children have proved satisfactory material. There is a wealth of material here to provide a difficult group of 'viewers' with suitable programmes.
6. That steps be taken to ensure that good programmes are given adequate publicity either directly or through interested groups.

"Children's librarians are alive to the immense influence which the modern media of radio and television have on the reading habits of

Canadian children.. We feel it is therefore of tremendous importance to consider carefully where these influences are leading.

"In discussing his well-known television programme, Dr. Frank C. Baxter (University of Southern California's TV 'Star') has some apropos remarks to make on the relation of television (and radio) to the development of a child's interests and on the responsibilities of those who produce their programmes. In reply to the question 'Is watching television an effective short cut to culture and education' he says:

'I think it's very jolly to watch snakes wriggle and tadpoles turn to frogs. Natural science runs amuck on TV and it can be lots of fun for all of us -- make no mistake about that. Television's educational programs can certainly be instructive in a piecemeal, haphazard sort of way. They fill one's mind with fascinating bric-a-brac. And at their best, they open up new horizons and arouse curiosity.

'But even network executives and producers, enthusiastic as they have a right to be about their wonderful new medium, do not expect it to work miracles. And it would be a full-fledged miracle if, by merely going to school and watching TV,

our children could grow up to be well-rounded cultured adults.

'Your television set is not a vending machine for higher learning. It can, at best, be an invitation to knowledge. That in itself is very much. God bless TV if it opens our eyes to the hidden treasures that await, for example, the reading of Robinson Crusoe. But God help us too, if the dramatized smattering on TV is all we ever get.'

"It is desirable, therefore, that you who offer 'this invitation to knowledge' and the children's librarians who have charge of the material which can satisfy the interest that has been aroused, work side by side in understanding, in order that the children can derive the greatest possible pleasure and value from our two 'media'."

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Miss Thomson, have you anything to add?

MISS THOMSON: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Miss Thomson, how should we understand your brief? Is it a warning bell or is it a complaint, or how do you appraise the situation on Canadian radio and television for children?

MISS THOMSON: I think I would say that there is, if one searches diligently, good material available for children. It has to be hunted out and sought after, and I am afraid that many of the

people who could and would enjoy it are unaware of what is being done unless some specified group takes steps to overcome that.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And in your opinion do you feel that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has done a reasonably good job by producing children's programmes?

MISS THOMSON: I think there are excellent programmes -- a small number. I think there is a place for a considerably larger number for different interests and different ages of children. The few that are being done are excellent, but I think they are many too few for the audience that is available for them.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Would this same judgment apply equally for the children's programmes produced by privately owned stations?

MISS THOMSON: You mean the fact that there are too few

MR. de GRANDPRE: Well, yes, or the fact that they are going in the right direction but have not gone far enough yet?

MISS THOMSON: I think what I said about the CBC being unhampered by any outside influences, shall I say, because most of the good children's programmes are not sponsored, and I think perhaps the private stations have an added handicap there because, as I said, usually the sponsors are not content to present programmes which are something that is complete in itself. They have secondary

purposes and usually that detracts from the quality of the programme.

MR. de GRANDPRE: This leads me to my next question. Are you in principle against the sponsorship of children's programmes, or would you qualify your answer?

MISS THOMSON: I would not like to say that. My experience has been with the unsponsored ones, but I see no reason that that should be so, but I think really what I mean is not the fact of sponsorship but the encroachment of it into the body of the programme.

THE CHAIRMAN: On that point are you not a little too absolute and perhaps a little too sweeping at the top of page 2 in your comments on sponsors. I would like to take an example -- and I am no expert in this field: let us get away from both the CBC and the private stations in Canada; one of the children's programmes that I happened to see is Disneyland, and that is sponsored?

MISS THOMSON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would find it difficult to accept the kind of criticism you are levelling at sponsors as applied to the sponsors of Disneyland.

MISS THOMSON: You see, I am speaking in regard to books, fairly largely. I haven't gone into the whole field of children's programmes, which is a very large one and questionable in some ways, but I am thinking of its relation to programmes as literature rather than just general variety

entertainment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I think you could even argue on the Disneyland programme that they get into books occasionally there too.

MISS THOMSON: Well, yes, you could.

THE CHAIRMAN: All I am putting in is a little suggestion that probably you are a little too sweeping in your remarks on sponsors as influencing the programmes. Some may do and some may not do, but this sounds as if you thought they all did.

MISS THOMSON: No, no, I hope not. It is just the risk that is run when a programme is sponsored.

MR. de GRANDPRE: There has been a certain amount of criticism about the children's programmes in the United States: do you feel that, by and large, the Canadian children's programmes are better suited for children than the American programmes, if you have made any study of the two in parallel?

MISS THOMSON: No, that is a rather -- I can only speak of what I know, and I might be unaware entirely of what goes on in the United States.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You think my question is unfair?

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us put it another way: We have had something, whether they come from the United States or are locally produced, the sort of children's programmes of violence, shooting and cowboys and Indians and wild west and so forth, and the argument has been put that those have a bad

effect on children. Have you any experience or comments to make on that?

MISS THOMSON: I would think one of their worst effects is the waste of time, because all the time those are being looked at there are so many other types of programme which are much more stimulating to children if they had an opportunity to see them and some way of finding out just what those programmes consisted of, because very often, as I said, the easy ones are the ones you look at, and my point is that I would like them to look at the others.

THE CHAIRMAN: Someone this morning called it "passivity of mind".

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is all, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for your brief, Miss Thomson.

MISS THOMSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission.

-

(Page 2505 follows)

-

-

SUBMISSION BY THE ASSOCIATION FRANCE-
CANADA OF TORONTO

THE CHAIRMAN: We have one other submission from the Association France-Canada of Toronto represented by Madame A.T.G.Bryan and Dr. Gordon Bates.

Madame Bryan, we will mark your brief as Exhibit 105.

EXHIBIT NO. 105: Brief of The Association France-Canada of Toronto.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that while this quite short submission is written in English you desire to present it in French, is that correct?

MADAME BRYAN: Yes. As you see I speak English with a very French accent. If you can understand me, I can speak English.

THE CHAIRMAN: We can understand your English and your French but the difficulty is that this was the only French submission we were likely to have and we have not a French-speaking verbatim reporter at present here.

MADAME BRYAN: I see. Well, I can very well present it in English.

THE CHAIRMAN: We could put in something of your comments from our notes and could make it up. It would be simpler for the reporters if you would do it in English.

MADAME BRYAN: I will. Mr. Chairman, if you would like me to I will read this very short brief. I will read it to you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do so.

MADAME BRYAN: Representing the continental French element in Ontario, it would be difficult for us to raise our voice and ask for French programmes on the television and radio broadcasting networks if the purely Canadian element -- the English-speaking as well as the French-speaking -- was not making some efforts at being instrumental in giving Ontario a better deal in the actual bilingualism of the province. Present circumstances being what they are, we strongly endorse all movements of opinion that would ensure our compatriots, some three thousand in number, the cheerful effects of hearing and seeing French programmes; this would minimize the effect the discovery of Ontario as a strictly English-speaking province could have on the morale of immigrants led to believe that one can get along very well on French alone in Canada.

In our opinion, it would be of service to the country to have immigrants satisfied their new surroundings fit the description given them at the beginning of their move to a new home.

We feel confident that we can speak also for the cultured immigrants from Central Europe, numbering in the thousands, for whom French represents the expression of culture and refinement they had to forego when escaping with their life.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Madame Bryan.

Do you have anything to add, sir?

DR. BATES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I happen to be the Vice-President of this organization. I

am not French but I am very sympathetic to the contents of this brief and the other brief which I represent. I also happen to be Vice-President of the l'Alliance Canadienne which presents a brief next Tuesday, but I will have to be in Ottawa when that brief is presented and there are a few remarks I would like to make now.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will be very glad to have you do that. We do not happen to have the brief of l'Alliance Canadienne in front of us at the moment but if you would like to comment on that, you may. We will have that brief when we come to it on Tuesday.

DR. BATES: The submission of the Department of French of the University of Toronto was useful. And I might say I am very sympathetic with everything that is in that brief.

It struck me that the question of French in Canada is a very important matter if we are going to have a united Canada. I have taken an interest in it myself to the extent of going to France twice in an endeavour to get some French into my head and I have found that two languages is most important internationally.

I happen to be also a director of the Health League of Canada and we are also a branch of an international organization, the World Health Organization, where we have found a knowledge of French is essential.

When it comes to the practical way of the matter it seems to me absurd to think that here in the City of Toronto we probably have two hundred

thousand people who have studied French and the percentage of people of English origin who can speak French fluently are just about as scarce as hen's teeth. That seems to me to be a situation which requires some examination.

When it comes to an understanding of the reasons; one of the reasons is that in spite of a knowledge of written French and perhaps to some extent of spoken French, there is no occasion to practise it. You cannot hear French on the radio. You cannot see it on the television. I have felt for a long time that something ought to be done about that.

Another curious angle to the thing is that one reason we cannot get French broadcasting is there seems to be something in the soil between here and Montreal so that we have the ridiculous situation of the two largest cities of Canada able to hear programmes from the United States. We can hear Washington, New York and Chicago. We cannot hear Montreal. In the name of national unity, surely these two cities ought to be able to hear one another themselves rather than the United States.

These are some of the things I have had in mind and which I would have presented here if I were to be here on the occasion of the presentation of the brief of l'Alliance Canadienne.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I just precede your questions? Dr. Bates, - will the l'Alliance Canadienne brief be presented by anyone else?

DR. BATES: Yes, it will be presented by

Mrs. Price, the president.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we will hear her then.
I am most grateful to you for these comments.

As far as your submission is concerned,
Madame Bryan, it is a useful approximation of the one
point that was made in the larger brief this morning.

MADAME BRYAN: Definitely, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are speaking, I take it,
for the residents of this area who came from France
itself.

MADAME BRYAN: From continental France, yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: There was just one question
on which I would like to have an expression of opinion
from this witness, Mr. Chairman, and that is a sug-
gestion which was made to us in Winnipeg that in order
to attract the English-speaking listener the pro-
gramme should be in French but conceived and produced
for an English-speaking audience. This morning we
heard another attitude. The Department of French
of the University of Toronto appeared to be against
this suggestion because they felt that it would
simply mean a French-speaking programme but that the
French Canadian culture would be lost in the pro-
duction of that programme. What would be your
opinion on this apparent conflict of opinions?

MADAME BRYAN: Well, I would very strongly
support the opinion of the Department of French of
the University of Toronto because we do want to have
a French programme which is not to be classed as
a French address to an English-speaking audience.

It is to give the English-speaking public a showing of what French is like spoken, thought and constructed.

There is a difference between the construction of thoughts in French and in English and if you give a French programme constructed with the Anglo-Saxon frame of mind, well, you have an English-speaking programme in French -- that is all.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You feel that there would be a loss if Professor Reid's suggestion would be put into actual practice?

MADAME BRYAN: Well, it would not be a loss but it would not be a French programme.

MR. de GRANDPRE: It would not be a full gain?

MADAME BRYAN: No. It would not be at all. It would mean it would amount to certainly a teacher's point of view which has to be made up very simply and very obviously so his pupil can understand the new tongue that he has studied to learn.

It would not be a French programme, and when I say that I think very definitely of the experiences we have had there. We have our French Theatre group in Toronto. We have put on the French authentic text of Antigone by Jean Anouilh. At the same time there was in the section of the other legitimate theatre in Toronto in English a text of Mr. Anouilh's translation. It was absolutely amazing the difference there was because the two things and the interpretation of the two things was entirely different. One was conceived by an English-speaking director and the other one was conceived by a French-

speaking director, and the two productions were so very widely apart that the director of the theatre thought it would be interesting to have this experiment to show to the English audience some excerpts of the French play in French -- to show the difference there was in interpretation; where it was from the purely French mind and French attitude or where it was just the translation giving the English approach to the text.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is all, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Madame Bryan, thank you very much. As I said before, this is on a very specific point so we have not any further questions to ask you.

DR. BATES: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might just have a minute now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DR. BATES: I have discussed this matter with Mr. Dunton and various other people and in some quarters it was stated that French broadcasts in Toronto might meet with some opposition. That may be true -- I do not know, but it seems to me that if there was some means whereby the Toronto listener could simply get a French broadcast on his dial there could be no possible objection to that.

THE CHAIRMAN: As an additional service rather than as a replacement?

DR. BATES: Yes. If it was going to replace something then there may be some objection. If we can get New York why can we not get Montreal?

THE CHAIRMAN: We will have to find that out.

DR. BATES: There may be some explanation.
That is my main contribution to this Commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, sir.

We will adjourn until ten o'clock tomorrow
morning.

---The Commission adjourned at 5.20 p.m.

INDEX

MAY 30, 1956.

SUBMISSIONS BY:

Page

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
(EXTENSION DEPARTMENT)

• • •

2326

Mr. J.R. Coulter

Dr. R.S. Harris

THE DEPARTMENT OF FRENCH, UNIVERSITY
OF TORONTO.

• • •

2361

Prof. C.D. Rouillard

Prof. W.H. Trethewey

Father L. J. Bondy

Prof. E.A. Joliat

Prof. R.W. Jeanes

THE NATIONAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE
STUDENT FEDERATION. . .

• • •

2387

Mr. Edward S. Rogers.

TORONTO TELEVISION OWNERS ASSOCIATION.

2414

Mr. A.A. Marshall.

TORONTO AND DISTRICT TRADES AND LABOUR
COUNCIL and TORONTO AND LAKE SHORE
LABOUR COUNCIL.

• • •

2426

Mr. Douglas Hamilton

Mr. Wm. Jenoves

Mr. Wm. Kearns

Mr. Archer

THE CANADIAN WIRE SERVICE GUILD

○ ○ ○

2469

Mr. Peter Reilly.

Mr. Philip Calder.

ONTARIO LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,
CHILDREN'S SECTION.

2493

Miss Jean Thomson.

THE ASSOCIATION FRANCE-CANADA OF
TORONTO

○ ○ ○

2505

Madame A.T.G. Bryan

Dr. Gordon Bates

<u>No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
98	Brief presented by the University of Toronto, Extension Department.	2326
99	Brief of the Department of French in the University of Toronto.	2361
100	Brief presented by the National Progressive Conservative Student Federation.	2387
101	Brief presented by the Toronto Television Owners Association.	2415
102	Toronto and District trades and Labour Council and Toronto and Lakeshore Labour Council brief.	2426
103	Brief of the Canadian Wire Service Guild.	2469
104	Brief of Ontario Library Association, Children's Section.	2493
105	Brief of The Association France-Canada of Toronto.	2505

ROYAL COMMISSION
ON
BROADCASTING

HEARINGS

HELD AT

TORONTO, ONT.

May 31, 1956

v. 16

ROYAL COMMISSION ON BROADCASTING

Toronto, Ontario.
June 6, 1956.

PRESENT:

THE CHAIRMAN	ROBERT M. FOWLER
COMMISSIONER	EDMOND TURCOTTE
COMMISSIONER	JAMES STEWART

COMMISSION COUNSEL	JAMES M. COYNE
	A. J. de GRANDPRE

SECRETARY	PAUL PELLETIER
-----------	----------------

May 31, 1956.

SUBMISSIONS BY:

YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION
Mrs. R. Smith, National President
Mrs. Agnes Roy - Exec. Secretary
Miss Earith Gould, Sec., Public Affairs
Committee

IMPERIAL ORDER DAUGHTERS OF THE EMPIRE
Mrs. J.P. Detwiler, M.B.E., Chairman
Mrs. Lumbers

CANADIAN MENTAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION
Dr. J. D. Griffin, General Director
Dr. Reva Gertstein, Ph.D. Consultant on
Programmes.

BUREAU OF BROADCAST MEASUREMENT

C. R. Vint, President
H. M. Stovin, Vice President
A. T. Gamble,
C. H. McDonald, Research and Development
Director
C. J. Follett, Exec. Secretary & Treasurer.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF MUSICIANS

Walter M. Murdoch, Executive Officer for
Canada
J. W. McMaster, Q.C., Counsel
Hugh Newtin

MAPLE LEAF GARDENS LIMITED

Henry Bolton, Manager
S. G. Evans, Publicity Director

CANADIAN ASSOCIATION FOR HEALTH, PHYSICAL
EDUCATION AND RECREATION

H. Deveney,
G. A. Wright, Provincial Director
N. R. Speirs
Miss M. Barker, National Secretary - Y
C. V. Box
A. Chetwynd, member and owner of Chetwynd
Film Company.

GROUP OF STUDENTS, JARVIS COLLEGE INSTITUTION

Miss Rosemary Frank.

---On resuming at 10.00 A.M.:

YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF CANADA

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, the first brief we are to hear this morning is from the Young Women's Christian Association of Canada, and is to be presented, I understand, by Mrs. R. Smith, the National President, Mrs. Agnes Roy, the Executors' Secretary and Miss Earith Gould, Secretary of the Public Affairs Committee. If you have anyone else with you I wish you would let us know.

We will begin by marking the brief as Exhibit 106.

EXHIBIT 106: Exhibit from Young Women's Christian Association of Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Our procedure here is quite informal, you can read the brief or summarize it, just as you see fit, and after that we may have some questions, either ourselves or our counsel which will be merely for the purpose of bringing the facts out and understanding exactly what your contention is. Will you proceed?

MRS. SMITH: Yes. Have you copies of the questionnaire which were distributed with the brief?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, we have not.

MRS. SMITH: I wanted to speak on that so I think perhaps we might take a moment to hand them over to you. The Y.W.C.A. of Canada is presenting this brief which is based on the results of a questionnaire which we sent to our local associations for use with various membership groups. The brief is based entirely on the results of the questionnaire, which, as you see, came in from a goodly number of groups

and we feel represents a cross-section of opinion from our membership.

You will recognize from the type of groups that are described in the brief that this is a group of people who are not experts by any means, they are in-expert and we took care in preparing this schedule, we felt, not to prejudice opinion in too many statements which we felt they would agree or disagree with as opinions expressed by the National Board, perhaps. For instance, we did not say, "This is what they think, do you agree", so that the replies might be completely spontaneous, completely free to present the feelings, the ideas, the judgment that they would draw from their own thinking.

In the appendices attached to the brief are the summaries of the opinions subdivided into groups and the list of cities and towns which replied to our questionnaire is listed in Appendix 1 and it represents more than half of our associations. We feel that is a fair sampling of opinion from our membership. I think the actual number is only about ten percent of our membership; we think they represent also a cross-section of age groups, educational levels and so on.

Now, in presenting the brief, the Board of the Y.W.C.A. of Canada, the National Board, would like to say that they agree with the majority of opinion expressed in this brief and, therefore, if the position is to be taken officially by our organization, that is our position as an association. We tried to avoid taking a position that does not reflect the opinion of our membership, we feel that the National Board should not impose on its membership an official position, but that our position is drawn as a result of this questionnaire. Therefore, we would like to concur in the majority opinion expressed

within this brief.

One item which is included is a matter of financing. We say that approximately 65 per cent of our membership would like to see a continuation of the financing by a combination of public and commercial funds. Three opinions are represented, financing by public funds, financing by a combination and financing by commercial funds.

Now, at first glance it might seem that that is contradictory if you add up the number of groups reporting and so on, you will see that those figures do not seem to come to the same totals. However, if you look at the questionnaire, the question on the back of that questionnaire is put in two divisions, saying that at the present time there are two ways of financing the CBC, first through the public treasury and secondly through commercial advertising. The people who compiled the replies to the questionnaire were very clearly of the opinion that the replies indicated that the people had combined these two in their thinking, so when they spoke of financing through public funds, what they really were referring to is a continuation of the present method which represents a combination, so that accounts for the 65 per cent which is really a total of the first two groups.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, you think there would be some people in the 65 per cent who perhaps might lean towards the support of the CBC or the public radio by public grants without commercial funds at all?

MRS. SMITH: Perhaps some, yes. And we could not divide those; but we could not break those two down. Now, I say that this is our majority opinion, that a continuation of financing by a combination of public

and commercial funds would be our official position. However, there is no doubt in anyone's mind that people replying to this questionnaire were not financial experts and we do not wish to emphasise the financial angle. However, when it comes to basic principles for broadcasting and television broadcasting, we feel that we are in a position to express an opinion and it is well founded that as a result of some study and thought, there is a depth of understanding of the objectives before the people of our country that we should be willing to support, that we should be willing to advocate.

Our membership would like to see top quality entertainment and educational programmes on our radio and television to a much larger extent than we find them at present, programmes expressing the higher artistic and moral standards. We feel that there should be some responsibility for upgrading of decisions and interests, and you may have wondered at the use in the brief of the phrase "The masses should reach", but that is what we had in mind, this upgrading of tastes and interest in the general population.

This is not merely a desire to see an increase in programmes that would appeal to the intellectual group but in general a broad interest in the upgrading of the type of programme that we hear. We feel that we would have a responsibility to raise standards of human values within our population, so that we can come to a sense of unity as a nation and build much better people. Basically, we feel that that will have its effect not only on our people as a nation, but it will spill over into the international field and help us to assume a position of responsibility and respect within that larger group. In that regard we feel that radio and television could give a good deal more attention to the

humanitarian accomplishment of the United Nations specialized agencies and you will find that mentioned in our brief.

Now, these basic principles, these means as we consider them in the overall programming of radio and television, we do not feel are exclusively within the public province or private enterprise. We feel that whatever the financing it could be held in mind very definitely by both public and private groups, we are supporting and are presenting programmes to the general public, we have concern for the level of advertising in the commercial areas, we recognize very clearly that the purpose of advertising is to sell a product and that is a completely legitimate objective of private enterprise, but we feel that as a segment of the community, advertising people, the commercial enterprise group have as great a responsibility to raise the standard of spiritual and cultural thinking within our public as the public do.

I feel the sole purpose of advertising cannot be selling a product if they are to play their rightful part in the life of a nation, the responsibility is theirs as well as a public responsibility to raise the standards as high as we can hold them. Therefore, we present this brief with our interests largely on the basic principles of increasing, improving the level of entertainment and programmes which will better our citizenry.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mrs. Smith; do either of your associates want to add anything?

MRS. SMITH: They will perhaps contribute to the discussion later.

MR. COYNE: Mrs. Smith, could you tell us a little about the nature of the local groups which replied to the questionnaire? Were there special committees set

up in the various localities or are there regular discussion groups in the various local units who received the questionnaires, or could you just describe briefly what sort of groups there were who responded?

MRS.SMITH: Yes, they would vary greatly from association to association, the list of cities, they will also vary as to size and kinds of group. They will vary as widely. We have in many associations public affairs committees who carry as their job the discussion of such questions as have come to the local associations, that group might have been one that would be in most of our associations a group of adults, pretty well informed people who would have some knowledge of some of the more involved matters that are concerned in this question. Others might be groups of teenagers or groups of young adults, who have been meeting for a discussion of all kinds of questions that concern their lives as young people. We feel that our association has a responsibility for making our young people or for helping our young people to be better informed and, therefore, we try to reach them with questions, no matter what kind of group it is, we try to reach them with questions so they will think about them and those groups would also have had this questionnaire, boards of directors would have had it so that there is a wide variety within the groups.

Would you like to add to that, Miss Gould?

MISS GOULD: No, I think you have said it very well indeed. The exact number of groups is listed there on the front page of the brief.

MR. COYNE: Yes, I see that. Is it common practice in your local associations to divide your members into, for instance, these groups, the Y teens and the young adults and the adults?

MRS. SMITH: Yes, it is. I think we might say

in some instances the groups may have in them a cross section of membership but that would be only in a few groups, perhaps.

MR. COYNE: Turning to your summary, the section on page 2 on financing. You refer to 65 per cent favouring the combination of public and commercial funds as a source of revenue and then you use this sentence:

"These groups believe this combination would result in a higher quality of programme content because it would provide the checks and balances of democratic procedure together with the competition of private enterprise."

I wonder if you would expand a little what you mean by that, "because it would provide the checks and balances of democratic procedure together with the competition of private enterprise."?

MRS. SMITH: Would you like to speak to that, Miss Gould?

MISS GOULD: Well, it was a consensus of opinion of the committee which examined the results that that was the intent of the 124 groups, they were concerned, very concerned about the content of programme, and they felt that either one group or the other, if they were checked against each other, would result in a better programme.

MR. COYNE: That is, they were thinking in terms of the CBC on one hand and the private stations on the other?

MISS GOULD: I do not think that they were thinking of the private stations but they were thinking of the free enterprise group, the advertisers.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think rather than distinction between CBC and private ownership, it might be more a distinction between the public type of broadcasting and the sponsored type of broadcasting?

MISS GOULD: I think that is true. We did not raise the question of the private broadcasting stations and that is not entered into to a very large extent in our replies.

MR. COYNE: I see. Well then, just turning to the 35 per cent who recommended complete financing from commercial funds, do you think that the people who replied to this questionnaire and answered that question had in mind any effect upon programme content which the choice of one method of financing or the other might have, or were they simply considering a general level and quality of programmes and then suggesting what they felt in principle should be the way of financing it? What I really mean is this, it has been suggested to us that if broadcasting was wholly dependent upon commercial funds, there simply would not be enough funds to support the type of broadcasting which we are able to enjoy, if we are prepared to put large sums of public money in, do you think that that effect upon programming, if you like, would have been in the minds of the people who answered this question or was it more a question of general principle?

MRS. SMITH: I think the general principle is the idea behind our answers, I do not know that the - I am not too clear, I am not sure I can answer your question clearly enough to be of much use to you, but I think that would be my answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: By the same token it has been suggested to us, take the field of television which perhaps is a little simpler, but I assume that if this

were put on a purely commercial basis, there would be a heavy economic pressure depending on United States produced programmes, films and the like, almost exclusively for the programme. Now, this contention, assuming it is right, it would of course - it may not affect the quality but it would certainly affect the nature of the programme, do you think that that kind of influence or possibility was in the minds of these 35 per cent who are thinking in terms of financing purely for commercial means?

MRS. SMITH: Will you answer that, Miss Gould, you were working with the questionnaire so closely.

MISS GOULD: Yes. You will notice on the front of the questionnaire, we ask the name of their favourite programme and I think their answer was based on a choice of programming, I do not think there was any analysis about it, they probably like some of the commercial programmes. The one-third that answered that way, it was precisely 43 groups, I think it was on the basis of their choice of programming.

MR. COYNE: But they must have been assuming that their favourite programme would continue even if the public funds were not available?

MISS GOULD: Yes, I think that was it.

MR. COYNE: Then, Mrs. Smith, in your introductory remarks, you spoke of the responsibility of the advertising group, that is, their general public responsibility in this field; did you have in mind any specific controls of a legal nature which should be imposed upon the commercial aspect of broadcasting or were you thinking more in terms of self-discipline, a sense of responsibility, more in the subjective sense which the advertising people should feel?

MRS. SMITH: When I spoke of it there I was referring to the responsibility they should have themselves. However, on page two of our brief in the summary of these points, the groups replying, you will notice under No. 5 we have stated that the groups have asked for regulation of the length and content of commercial advertising.

MR. COYNE: There is such a regulation at the present time?

MRS. SMITH: Yes, we were aware of that and that would therefore be a continuation of that regulation very carefully watched.

THE CHAIRMAN: But taking that one stage further, there are five other items that this group wants, some of which are fairly intangible and would not be subject to direct regulation, probably. Let us take item 6, opportunities for Canadian talent; now, you said that advertisers ought to have a sense of responsibility for improving programmes just as well as the CBC would have. I do not say they have not, but let us suppose that they do not, do you think that your organization and the groups it represents, talking as though they did not have responsibility in the matter of opportunities for Canadian talent, let us assume that, do you think that your group would say this should rely on the slow process on the education of the advertisers or should this be a matter of regulation?

MRS. SMITH: I do not believe that any opinion was expressed in that direction, I do not think the use of Canadian talent would necessarily mean downgrading of the programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: From some points of view it may be the reverse, the use of Canadian talent for the

purposes of Canadian programmes would be upgrading of the programmes?

MRS. SMITH: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Which they might, for economic reasons, the advertisers might not wish to undertake. I am only putting a case to you, I am not suggesting that is so.

MRS. ROY: I would think from the discussion we had in our board meeting when, as Mrs. Smith said, the National Board said they would concur in the majority of opinion expressed in this brief, that there would be a good deal of confidence in the democratic process and the fact that advertisers are people who care about Canada and the democratic process, and could help in educating so that this could be achieved not all by regulation but there would be real confidence in our group in the development of a sense of responsibility in relation to such items as these.

THE CHAIRMAN: I find in reading this, a possible contradiction between these two paragraphs; on page 2 where you are talking, under financing, and apparently speaking with approval of the effect of competition in raising the standard of the programmes, but you also have some pretty firmly held basic principle here which involve, or could involve considerable regulation. In item 2 you speak of a high standard of speech and so on, and that could be a matter of regulation; no liquor advertisements is already there and would continue to be. A reduction in the number of soap operas and westerners and the elimination of programmes which glamorize crime could be a matter of regulation; it is obvious the length and content of commercial advertising is regulation and the opportunities for Canadian talent could be regulation. Now, the point I am

wondering is, how you can apparently be supporting the notion of a considerable degree of regulation here and at the same time apparently pinning your faith on the force of competition. That is not exactly a question, but if you have any comments I would be glad to have them.

(Page 2527 follows)

MRS. SMITH: I don't feel that they have to be mutually exclusive, and a lot of our groups did not feel that this represented a contradiction.

Do you want to enlarge on that, Mrs. Gould?

MRS. GOULD: I don't think they are mutually exclusive.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me put it this way:

Supposing competition didn't achieve the basic principles you were after, would you be prepared to have regulations put in to achieve them, or would you say, "Well, we have just lost out on that"?

MRS. SMITH: Well, I think we would want regulations, but I don't think that competition necessarily means that they wouldn't move toward them providing sufficient emphasis were put on that angle.

THE CHAIRMAN: By whom?

MRS. SMITH: By the regulating body.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see. I don't suggest for a moment that competition won't work that way, but how far do you go with your basic principles? Do you want them by regulation if necessary?

MRS. SMITH: Yes.

MRS. ROY: Yes, definitely.

MRS. SMITH: Our emphasis is on the basic principles, and if regulation is required to secure them, then secure them that way.

MR. COYNE: Would it be fair to say, from your outline of basic principles, that, by and large, your association supports the present type of structure for broadcasting in this country, and what you have in mind is the operation of the CBC, or a national broadcasting system, in which the private commercial stations play a very definite part?

MRS. SMITH: Yes, that is right.

MR. COYNE: Turning to one or two aspects of the detailed replies, first of all, in appendix 2 on page 2 - and this is where you are summarising the Y-teens - "On television, they would like to see more Canadian talent, more comedies and programmes of interest to teen-agers..." We have had other people before us who have also stressed the fact that in the present programming there does seem to be a gap as between the programmes for children, of which there are some, and the programmes for adults, and I am just wondering whether you might be able to indicate what type of programmes interest teen-agers?

MISS ROY: This is very interesting, Mr. Chairman, because the teen-age groups in the Y.W.C.A. have talked a good deal about that and, as we work with the Association, since the questionnaire went out we have had a good reaction from teen-agers who have said: "But we helped to prepare the brief for the Royal Commission." They feel they are in this.

As to the kind of broadcasting they would like, they want jazz music, they want dance music, they want the teen-age jive kind of thing, but they also want the kind of things - for instance, a career programme on what are the possible careers for teen-agers to be interested about in their future; camping is another thing they think could be talked about, which could be programme material on both TV and radio. They like discussion programmes and they like to be in on them. We have had them, as you will note, with teen-agers on television and radio, but our judgment on some of them is that they have not been carefully prepared, and they have been put on the air without preparation,

ahead of time, and they are not happy about them, nor is the group, nor the audience. There could be a kind of discussion, with questions and answers, with teen-agers participating in it. They like not only to be called in on a programme, but to be called in to help plan it and to be part of the set-up and the programming.

These are just a few of them.

MR. COYNE: These are quite distinct interests as compared with the interests of children's groups and the interests of the adults?

MRS. SMITH: Quite.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think you can get the teen-agers to turn away from jazz and jive programmes ever?

MISS ROY: Yes, I think you can. They want both. But when you say "Can you get them to turn away" I think it takes leadership. You have to see them in the intermission, while they are having a coke, and ask what they think about apart from jive.

MR. COYNE: Turning to appendix 4, which is the adult group, on the first page you are speaking of preferences on radio and television, and at the bottom of the page you say: "Television - Music, news, drama, sports and children's programmes were the favourites. 111 preferences were expressed for Canadian programmes as compared with 126 for U.S.A. programmes."

Do you know how they would categorize a programme that is, in fact, an American programme but is brought into Canada and shown over the Canadian network? That, presumably, would be a U.S.A. programme?

MRS. SMITH: Yes.

MR. COYNE: That doesn't simply mean 126 programmes watched on United States stations.

MRS. SMITH: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where is that reference, Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: That is on the first page of appendix 4, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. ROY: Our judgment would be that it is American sponsored that they are talking about - American programmes that are brought in as well as the American programmes that come straight from American channels.

MR. COYNE: It really relates to the place where they are produced, not the channel they are listened to on.

MRS. SMITH: No.

MR. COYNE: Those are the only questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have no possible way of breaking down this 126 figure?

MRS. SMITH: Yes, I guess, I guess you could have these figures in greater detail.

THE CHAIRMAN: The sort of thing I am thinking of is, really, if that 126 who expressed preferences for the U.S.A. programmes is based mainly on the U.S.A. programmes that are carried on the CBC national network, then it is not a complete sample of U.S. programming, it is a selection. On the other hand, if it is based directly on U.S.A. programming, it is a comparison of their overall picture against ours.

I think it is the point of Mr. Coyne's question as to whether or not this 126 is a preference for U.S.A. programmes which come mainly through the CBC system or a preference for U.S.A. programmes heard direct. It does make a difference, because the two

aren't the same.

MRS. GOULD: If you look at the questionnaire you will see "Radio", "Television" and "U.S.A. Programmes". Actually, in the processing of these we have the exact names of the programmes, because you will see the question was: "What is the name of your favourite programme?" We didn't incorporate it in the brief, but we have got it - the names.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you see the point I am after. We would like a break-down of that figure, if it is not too much trouble. If you can break that down it would be helpful.

MRS. SMITH: It would be; and we could get them to you very easily.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, not only for your brief and the presentation of it, but for the obvious interest that has gone into the subject in your questionnaire and in your discussion.

MRS. SMITH: Thank you very much.

- - - - -

(Page 2532 follows)

SUBMISSION OF
IMPERIAL ORDER DAUGHTERS OF THE EMPIRE

APPEARANCES:

MRS. J. P. DETWILER, M.B.E., CHAIRMAN

MRS. LUMBERS.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is from the Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire, of which Mrs. Detwiler is the Chairman.

MRS. DETWILER: May I explain that the National Annual Meeting of the Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire is still in session in Quebec City.

I did explain in my letter to the Secretary that we might have to change the names of those would be in attendance. I didn't think we would have to reduce it to this extent! But I have with me Mrs. Lumbers, a past national president, who is a member of the Committee. I asked her to come with me for moral support.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I am sorry we came at a time when it was inconvenient, but it is very hard not to have that happen occasionally.

We will mark your brief as Exhibit 107.

EXHIBIT 107: Brief of the Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire.

I don't know whether you have been listening long enough to know the method we use. You may read the brief or you may summarize it as you see fit.

MRS. DETWILER: I think I shall read it, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well.

MRS. DETWILER: I have a foreward in this brief which will, perhaps, clarify the position of the Order in connection with the presenting of a brief.

On the following pages the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire (I.O.D.E.) presents its brief to the Royal Commission on Broadcasting.

The Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire, with a membership of 32,098, is organized throughout Canada in 971 local units known as Chapters.

That figure may be changed after the national annual meeting. I am not sure of the exact number now.

As the largest women's patriotic organization in the Dominion, it has served the country through peace and war, and has expended millions of dollars on its varied activities.

The Order is a body of voluntary workers, guided by aims and objects among which are the following:

"To forward every good work for the
"betterment of their country and
"people; to assist in the progress
"of art and literature, and to instil
"into the youth of their country
"patriotism in its fullest sense."

Although the Order of Reference deals primarily with finances, the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire feels impelled to submit a brief setting forth its views on "Standards" and "The Licensing and Control of Private Telecasting and Sound Broadcasting Stations in the Public Interest."

It cannot be stated too forcefully that the Order's interest in broadcasting (sound and telecasting) lies in the kind and quality of

programmes broadcast in Canada, and in their influences on Canadian life.

RADIO BROADCASTING

In Canada, broadcasting is considered a public trust, and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has developed into what many people believe to be the greatest single agency for national unity, understanding and enlightenment.

On the other hand, private stations perform a real service to local communities by providing local news, local advertising and information, and by the promotion of worthy causes.

As a matter of fact, we feel that the community station is as important as the local newspaper.

However, their general lack of interest in things cultural has been a matter for comment, and indeed concern.

That sounds like a criticism, perhaps, counter-acting what I said just a moment ago; there are some criticisms, but there are many good points which will be brought out later.

With the coming of television it was thought that radio might suffer an eclipse. Already a number of commercial network entertainment programmes have been lost to radio, as well as some attractive and popular shows. This loss of commercial revenue, combined with mounting costs, has made Canadians apprehensive for the future of radio. However, since a great many Canadian citizens are wholly dependent on the services of radio, we feel

measures must be taken to assure the continuance and development of this important medium.

The Committee therefore recommends:

"That, in spite of increased costs,
"the C.B.C. continue to produce radio
"programmes of the same high calibre as
"heretofore."

International Service

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is to be warmly commended for its very practical programmes in the field of international service. Nevertheless in spite of its European service with a coverage of thirteen countries, and its Latin American service in four languages, complaints are voiced by the New Canadians that the C.B.C. broadcasts -- that is, the overseas service -- do not give sufficient information about Canada, nor does Canadian radio devote enough time to the activities and problems of newcomers.

We therefore recommend:

"That the C.B.C. investigate these
"complaints and, if necessary, revise
"its service to meet not only the needs
"of newcomers to Canada, but also those
"of prospective newcomers."

Programmes of National Interest.

Our concern with the radio as a means of national unity and general education has directed our interest to such programmes as "Wednesday Night", "Citizens' Forum", "Farm Forum", "Talks Programmes",

"Trans-Canada Matinee", and "In Reply".

I would like to say there are many others not mentioned here.

The C.B.C. is to be congratulated on the excellent quality of these programmes.

In the fields of drama and music the Corporation is doing a magnificent job. Many young Canadian actors and musicians "have arrived" due to the opportunities presented by the C.B.C. While the organization of the C.B.C.'s own symphony orchestra is an achievement in itself.

Radio seems to be a better medium than television for serious talks. The grimacing and gesticulations of speakers on television are distracting to a viewer.

The Committee therefore recommends:

"That the C.B.C. continue to provide
"adequate funds for the maintenance of
"the department or departments responsible
"for the radio 'Talks' programmes."

Advertising.

Many people are opposed to a national network selling time for commercial advertising, and there is a tendency to underestimate the importance of advertising in the economic life of a country. One of the most serious problems in Canada is the smallness of its domestic market compared with its productive capacity. It is therefore important to let people know what has been produced.

We therefore recommend:

"That the national network refuse all
"local commercial business for those stations
"which it operates direct, except in places
"where advertising service from private
"stations is not available".

And be it further recommended:

"That, if the national network feels
"it necessary to continue its policy of
"commercial advertising to finance in part
"its sustaining programmes and to ensure
"Canadian advertisers of a national
"audience, then first consideration be
"given to the advertising of products
"produced in Canada, and the accuracy of
"such advertisements be given careful
"supervision."

TELECASTING:

It is still too early to assess the real value of television -- this new medium of communication. It has been hailed with interest and enthusiasm by the general public, by advertisers, and by those who wish to inform, and influence, the public.

No one can deny that the new medium of "mass communication" holds possibilities of serious danger to our standards of value, as well as possibilities of great benefit through the spread of increased knowledge and enlightenment.

Community Institutes.

In order to get the reaction of community leaders to television, the C.B.C. has been holding

Community Institutes in centres where television stations are now established. In this way the basis of co-operative relationship between the television station and the community has been established.

We recommend therefore:

"That the C.B.C. continue to promote community institutes in all centres in which television stations are now established."

Television and Education.

Wherever community institutes have been held, great concern has been expressed regarding the effects of television on education. To be sure television is a fait accompli which we cannot undo, even if we would. What then do we fear? Just this, we are succumbing one by one to "technological illiteracy".

Psychologists and educators are becoming more concerned with television's possibilities for evil than they are impressed with its possibilities for good. The President of a well-known university asks: "What happens when we are all too busy to read; when our ways of life and work finally conquer our taste for reading as well as our belief in its utility? What are we doing under our forest of television masts?" The answer: "We have traded in the mind's eye for the eye's mind."

Where all visual mass media of communication fail is in the realm of abstract thought. That cannot be communicated by pictures. Yet it is man's greatest glory: It is the power of abstract thought

which separates the human from the animal.

For this reason, and confident that Canadian educators will accurately assess television's place in the field of education, our Committee is prepared to support the request for further experiments.

May I say just there that, of course, the experiment is now over, but at the time this was written it had not been undertaken.

Therefore we recommend:

"That a further experiment into
"classroom television be undertaken
"by the C.B.C. in co-operation with
"the National Advisory Council on
"School Broadcasting to clarify the
"role of television in the classroom".
Canada's National Television System.

The C.B.C. is still in the experimental stage with television, but it is to be congratulated on the scope of its programmes, the standards that have been established, and the distribution that has been achieved - all in the space of three and one-half years.

The broadcast of films from the library of the National Film Board, the special religious programmes, and the programmes on art, cultural subjects, and drama from abroad are to be commended. On the other hand the local drama, news features, and quizz programmes leave much to be desired in variety and direction.

Television is a new special form of art,

with new and different powers over the attention and convictions of its audience, and it should devote itself to evolving its own new styles and distinctions. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has already achieved success in the new medium, as well as in radio. In April of 1955, at the 19th American Exhibition of Education Radio and Television Programmes conducted at Ohio State University in Columbus, the National System was 19 awards -- 16 in radio and 3 in television.

Licensing and Control of Private Stations.

The Canadian system has a striking peculiarity in that it retains within the national system the existence of "private", "commercial", or "community" stations as they are variously called. In 1952, when the Government indicated to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation that it was now ready to receive applications from the private stations for licenses to telecast in areas not then served, nor to be served by publicly-owned facilities, the Minister made it clear that, for the present, no two stations would be licensed to serve the same area.

Obviously it is the policy of the Dominion Government to keep a tight rein on the development of television in Canada. It would seem, however, that the Government's policy creates and protects monopoly both for the C.B.C. and for the selected private stations. Each has complete monopoly in its own area.

After serious consideration of the present situation the Committee recommends:

"That the question of issuing licenses
"for telecasting to additional private
"stations be reopened, and that those
"prepared to finance a telecasting
"station be allowed to do so."

Control.

After careful study of both the majority and minority reports of the Massey Commission, the Committee agreed that Broadcasting (sound and telecasting) should continue to be under the control of the Dominion Government, but was of the opinion that the Canadian Broadcasting Act should be amended to provide for the creation of an independent regulatory body, as recommended in the minority report of Dr. Arthur Surveyor.

The Committee therefore recommends:

"That the Canadian Broadcasting Act
"be amended to provide for the creation
"of an independent regulatory body with
"authority and jurisdiction over the
"activities of both the private and
"the publicly-owned broadcasting (sound)
"and telecasting stations, this body
"to report to the Minister of Transport
"and to be known as the Canadian Broad-
"casting and Telecasting Control Board."

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to add anything further beyond your written brief at this stage, Mrs.

Detwiler¹, or will we proceed with the questions?

MRS. DETWILER: I think, perhaps, further information will come out in the questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Feel perfectly free to explain any points. Have you anything to add at this point?

MRS. DETWILER: No, I have nothing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. de Grandpre?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Could you tell us how this brief was prepared? We have heard, for instance, that the brief of the Y.W.C.A. was prepared by referring the matter to the members and then the Executive reflects the opinion of the members -- other associations proceeded in a different manner -- and that the Executive prepared the brief and submitted the brief to the members for their approval or comments. How was this one prepared?

MRS. DETWILER: As a matter of fact, the preparation of this one practically started in 1937, when the Order became interested in the effects of radio at that time on the people, primarily, perhaps, on the children -- the young people. A committee was set up at that time which has been functioning ever since.

Last year, for instance, a number of these recommendations were presented to the national annual meeting which was held in Winnipeg, and passed by the national annual meeting in session.

I am using many of those recommendations in this particular brief.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But the brief itself in its final form was never referred to a general meeting?

MRS. DETWILER: It was referred to the national executive committee which represents the Order all across Canada.

MR. de GRANDPRE: When these recommendations were discussed at the last general convention could you tell us whether the views expressed by the resolutions were unanimous views, or whether there was a strong dissenting section?

MRS. DETWILER: I would say that the recommendations were accepted by about 75% of the members present.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And were the others opposed, or did they simply refrain from expressing any opinion?

MRS. DETWILER: I would not use as strong a word as "opposed". Perhaps "indifference" in some cases.

(Page 2544 follows)

31
MR. de GRANDPRE: From the tone of Part I which refers to the position of Canadian Broadcasting, I take it it is a fair conclusion to say that the Order approves the partnership which has existed up to now between the C.B.C. on the one hand and the private stations on the other in order to give a national service to Canada?

MRS. DETWILER: Well, I don't know whether I would call it a partnership or not. I think it has perhaps clarified that idea in my own mind, but we do approve of the working together of C.B.C. and the private stations, or independent stations, whichever we like to call them. We feel that the C.B.C. could not possibly do the work that the independent stations do in their local communities.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Would you push your argument further and say private stations could not do what the C.B.C. is now doing at the national level?

MRS. DETWILER: Well, they are not organized to do it, certainly.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any doubts about the question? If you have, for goodness sakes say so.

MRS. DETWILER: Well, I think that is not a question that I want to go into, actually. The private stations were operating before the C.B.C. ever came into being, and while we would not for a moment say they were doing a national job, yet they were doing a reasonably good job in many cases; but I feel that it is a perfect set-up to have,

because, as I said, the local newspaper or the community station, I think they are essential to the communities, and the C.B.C. would be under terrific expense to set up enough stations to do the work that the private stations are doing, and, I presume, vice versa.

THE CHAIRMAN: Really, I think the question comes down to what the view of the I.O.D.E. would be on the present statutory provision which says the C.B.C. shall carry on a national broadcasting service within Canada.

MRS. DETWILER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And they do that, as we have been told, partly through their own operations, their own programme productions, and their own stations, and partly through private stations.

MRS. DETWILER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the existing set-up, and I think the question is, does a continuation of that present set-up commend itself to you?

MRS. DETWILER: Well, the continuation of the service we are getting certainly is satisfactory now. I am not a technician, and I don't know anything about the inward workings.

THE CHAIRMAN: Irrespective of the mechanics of getting it, does the I.O.D.E. feel that there should be a national broadcasting service?

MRS. DETWILER: Yes, they do.

MR. de GRANDPRE: While we are on this point we may as well touch on the last recommendation that you make because there is some relationship

between the two problems. I take it you adopt the conclusion of Mr. Surveyer in the Massey Report in connection with the independent regulatory body?

MRS. DETWILER: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You also indicate that this independent body should report to the Minister of Transport: Do you also imply that the C.B.C. should report to the Minister of Transport under the amended Act that you are suggesting?

MRS. DETWILER: We feel that an independent regulatory body would be the over-all for both systems. That is not a good word to use -- "systems", but, at least, for the C.B.C. and the independent stations.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Well, the word "regulations", "rules" and "regulatory body" have been used, and I don't think we have been able to find a proper definition of "regulations" so far; there are at least three kinds of regulations which come to my mind; the regulations relating to the technical aspects of the airwaves, the allotment of channels and things like that; there are also the regulations which could deal with network operations, whether a particular station is to be on the network on a particular date; there is also a third class which could be called the regulations which would deal with the content of the programme, the amount of advertising and whether there should be liquor advertising or not. Would you feel this independent body should have the necessary powers to regulate on these three scores?

MRS. DETWILER: I think that was in the minds of the members of the Order.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was the distinction in the minds?

MRS. DETWILER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The distinction between the different kinds of regulation -- was that in their minds?

MRS. DETWILER: Yes, I think so, when this resolution was passed.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Well, there could be others, but I am suggesting those three for the time being.

MRS. DETWILER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like you to examine that question again, because if the distinction between the different kinds of regulation was in the minds of the members of the I.O.D.E. when they framed this resolution, I think they are about the only people who have had it in their minds to date. Was it really a distinction, or was it simply the principle of an independent regulatory body all thrown in without a definition of what "regulation" meant?

MRS. DETWILER: I am going to ask my partner here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, do by all means.

MRS. DETWILER: Unfortunately, I am in this position, that I wasn't at the Winnipeg meeting. The Chairman of this special committee that was set up presented the report. I was on that committee

and prepared the material at least in part for the presentation, but I was not able to go to the meeting, so I only got the information from the Chairman about this yesterday -- I mean, to check up on it. She is ill, otherwise she would have been here, and that seemed to be in the minds of the members, true. As I said before, we are not technicians and we are not financiers, but we like the idea of an independent body which would work on similar lines to the railroads that are under the Department of Transport -- or, at least, they report to them and they deal with them, and I think their problems are presented by the Minister to the House of Commons.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I think in answer to a question put by the Chairman you said that you agreed that the C.B.C. had the responsibility of providing a national broadcasting system?

MRS. DETWILER: I agreed that there should be a national broadcasting system.

MR. de GRANDPRE: All right, and that the C.B.C. has been given the responsibility to provide it?

MRS. DETWILER: Up to date, yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Up to date. Accepting this premise, do you think it is possible to have this responsibility to provide a national service without having the authority to make certain regulations which will give this national service?

MRS. DETWILER: Of course, I do not know how Government bodies work, particularly. I know

how organizational bodies work: we would have various committees appointed on various things, and one person from the regulatory body in charge of that particular committee. The recommendations would then be considered, and I can't see there would be any great difficulty.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are not trying to press you beyond your own sphere, but yours is an important organization and has many members, and we are most anxious to know what it is they really say, and that is the only reason for putting these things to you. On this question let us give an illustration to sort of try and show what is behind it, I think: Suppose for the sake of argument there was a desirable, cultural or educational programme that we would all agree should be carried as widely as possible throughout Canada, let us say produced by C.B.C., for the purposes of illustration, and suppose a private station at that particular moment, for whatever good reasons they might have, decided that they were not going to carry it and they had other things they wanted to do -- maybe a good popular commercial programme. You may get into these kind of collisions. Yet, you have got the C.B.C. charged with the job of getting out desirable national programmes. Now, as a piece of operating procedure where does your organization think the advantage would lie in having the power to regulate that type of thing shifted over to an independent regulatory body?

MRS. DETWILER: Well, I think the Order

feels that it is a very difficult job for any organization set up, say, as the C.B.C. is at the present time, to do broadcasting itself and then stand outside itself in a sense, if you can understand what I mean, and look at the other fellow's problems and say whether their judgment or what they want done is right and feasible and fair. It would be most difficult for an individual, it would be a superhuman person who could do that when his own interests were concerned as well as the interests of another body, in a sense bound together, to stand back and see it from the other person's point of view. I am not suggesting for a moment that the C.B.C. has been unfair. I think it is very highly regarded at the present time by the private stations, but I am saying it is hard to do the operating and also to administer the controls.

THE CHAIRMAN: Unless the administration is part of the operating. I think we will all agree -- I think the Commission will -- that the problems of radio and television are difficult, and in Canada particularly, but how do you feel that a separate regulatory body -- let us suppose we had it tomorrow; it would be bound, I think, to take account of the problem of the C.B.C. in getting a national programme out.

MRS. DETWILER: I should think it would have to, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It would also have to take account of the private station's point of view and

to some extent weigh up the two contentions or the two different points of view. It would be made up, presumably, of men appointed from across Canada who were public-spirited and able -- men and women. How would it be any different from the kind of board that is doing it now?

MRS. DETWILER: Well, the kind of board that is doing it now has a special function, I feel, in connection with C.B.C. It was realized early in the history of C.B.C. that they certainly needed the private stations that were already set up; I am not sure for what reason, I can't read their minds about that, but I think it would be on account of the overwhelming^{task}/of putting up other stations replacing the ones that were there.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been suggested to us further that the combination which you have endorsed in your brief of the private stations being an affiliate and part of a national system had advantages other than cost.

MRS. DETWILER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It had the advantage of local adaptability and flexibility -- a peculiarly Canadian compromise.

MRS. DETWILER: Yes, it doesn't exist in other places.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but that doesn't necessarily make it a bad thing. In fact, it may make it a good thing.

MRS. DETWILER: That is true, that it

could, but I still think it could be a good thing under an independent regulatory board, and I think we might achieve the same results with the feeling that the C.B.C. was no longer controlling and operating and regulating the functions, but the independent board would take that over. The C.B.C. would continue, we hope very much, to produce its very fine programmes, because we are behind that.

THE CHAIRMAN: What do you mean by the word "independent" board?

MRS. DETWILER: Well, I said the "independent regulatory board".

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but independent of what?

MRS. DETWILER: Well, neither of these two systems would be in control -- neither one would be in control of the other. That does irk people sometimes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it probably arises as to whether or not the first decision that has to be made is, have we two systems or one?

MRS. DETWILER: Well, we have one system as far as broadcasting is concerned, but we have two types of set-up, if I may put it that way.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want you to understand clearly these questions about the independent regulatory body are directed with no thought of decision at all, but naturally you are for it and we are going ask you about it.

MRS. DETWILER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And it necessarily must be

from that point of view, but there is another element, of cost, in this; have you considered that?

MRS. DETWILER: I don't think we considered that to the same extent. As I say, I wasn't at the meeting so I didn't hear all the questions, although there is a record of a good many of them. Unfortunately, my colleague here wasn't at the meeting either in Winnipeg, but I am not sure the cost was stressed.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I don't want to labour this point any further. There is just one question arising out of this recommendation: As it is now the C.B.C. is responsible to Parliament, and I see you want to make a change and make this new board responsible to a Minister of the Crown, and yesterday when the Labour people were before us they said that they preferred to have the C.B.C. responsible to Parliament instead of it being responsible to a Minister of the Crown, and they made the distinction that if it is responsible to a Minister of the Crown it becomes a State-owned organization, while if it is responsible to Parliament it is a publicly-owned organization, and that the Canadian public has more control over the C.B.C., or whatever body would later come into being, by it being responsible to Parliament itself. Do you have any comments to make on this?

MRS. DETWILER: Well, I feel that we did not consider by having the channels through the Minister of Transport -- we considered he simply

presented the case to Parliament, and I think I said it was to be under the Government, did I not?

MR. de GRANDPRE: "... this body to report to the Minister of Transport ..."

MRS. DETWILER: In the preliminary to "Control" I have mentioned that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the point was made to us in Vancouver that there were distinct and positive advantages in the present system of not reporting, to use the strict words, to the Dominion Government, but reporting to Parliament, and that that was a desirable thing to avoid even the danger or possibility of Governmental interference with the C.B.C. -- "Governmental" interference as distinct from "Parliamentary" interference. These distinctions sometimes are important and we want to know if you regard them as such?

MRS. DETWILER: Actually, at the present time I think it would be the Government that was in control and not Parliament.

THE CHAIRMAN: We won't get into that.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You refer to the international service on page 4 of your brief and you feel this service should be continued and that, if possible, it should be made Canadian?

MRS. DETWILER: I am not in charge of that department in the I.O.D.E. We have someone in charge of the department working with new Canadians, and I am not prepared to make any statement, because I do not know enough about it, but I was

asked to present this to the Commission.

MR. de GRANDPRE: All right. On page 6 you make a recommendation, "that the national network refuse all local commercial business for those stations which it operates direct, except in places where advertising service from private stations is not available." I understand that this is the actual practice followed by C.B.C.?

MRS. DETWILER: Yes, I think it is.

MR. de GRANDPRE: In radio?

MRS. DETWILER: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Was that recommendation made simply to show that you feel ---

MRS. DETWILER: We still agree with that.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You still agree?

MRS. DETWILER: And it was made primarily because of the second recommendation, because in the beginning we object to C.B.C. having advertising at all. However, we realize that a certain amount of revenue must be had, and, more than that, we were willing to have products produced in Canada -- that does not necessarily mean, of course, Canadian products, but they are produced here -- advertised by the C.B.C.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is what you meant when you said further down, "if the national network feels it necessary to continue its policy ..."?

MRS. DETWILER: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Then you deal with the question of television in education and you suggest

that television be used in the classroom to help in the education of children. It was pointed out yesterday that television has a tendency to create or develop pacivity?

MRS. DETWILER: I agree with that 100%.

MR. de GRANDPRE: By pushing this television broadcasting into the classrooms, don't you feel that you will encourage this attitude?

MRS. DETWILER: May I say that the National Advisory Board on Education -- I couldn't say whether the C.B.C. approached that Board or whether the Board approached C.B.C. -- but they did ask, I think, that an experiment be carried out with regard to television in the classroom. I can see value in television in the classroom if the teacher prepares the lesson first and teaches it as it should be taught. Then you could have the television and make it a visual thing to the children, what they had been learning either by word of mouth from the teacher or from reading. I can see an advantage in that, but I certainly cannot see an advantage -- in fact, it is detrimental, I think, and I was a teacher myself so I know from experience a little about it, that you try to teach by visual aid, by pictures, a lesson. When this flickers across the screen you certainly have no time to think about it, and all the children remember is what they saw. They get information, I am prepared to admit that, but they do not get education.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your experience is greater

than mine, but it was suggested to us in one place that really great help could be had by teaching Canadian history by television films which would, let us say, trace the course of the explorers' trips across Canada and that kind of thing. If that came on first as a straight visual matter, even without a preceding lesson, may it not stimulate children into pursuing that historical study further?

MRS. DETWILER: Of course, there are certain subjects that lend themselves more to seeing pictures than others, as you can realize. At the same time I think there should be preliminary preparation made by the teacher, and then this to show them the pictures of what might portray our earlier days.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have one other question that may fit in here: On page 8 you say, "Psychologists and educators are becoming more concerned with television's possibilities for evil than they are impressed with its possibilities for good." So far we have not been exposed, as far as I know, to any psychologists, but we have had a number of educators before us, and they seem to take the opposite line to that. They have all been emphasizing the tremendous possibilities for good, and of course they sounded a few warnings. I wonder if this is not too absolute a statement?

MRS. DETWILER: Well, I didn't feel so when I made it. May I take an illustration, and this is not bearing on this, but it is the same idea: We call ourselves a nation greatly interested in

sports. Well, there are only very few members of the nation who really play the sports; the rest of us sit in a seat and enjoy it. That is a very passive interest and I feel the interest is along educational lines. They are very interested -- I have one little child in mind at the moment who can name everything he saw on a television programme, and he is only four years old, but he does not know anything about these things. He can see the pictures and that is all, and we are developing that passivity along other lines. Our magazines are putting pictures now with a minimum of explanation or, say, information.

THE CHAIRMAN: Take your four-year-old child; if he hadn't had the television he would have neither the facts nor the information. At least he has the facts.

MRS. DETWILER: He is actually too young to benefit by education, but he could remember, and children can remember, but they can't think, and that is the thing that makes education.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You suggest that the Government policy of limiting the number of television stations should be modified and that competitive stations should be allowed: Do you visualize this step to be taken or this change of attitude to take place immediately, or only at a later stage when national coverage will have been obtained, because, as you know, there are a number of areas in Canada now that do not have television?

MRS. DETWILER: I realize that.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And does that suggestion or that recommendation that the Order makes mean for the immediate time or at a future time?

MRS. DETWILER: I think the Order feels that competition is a good thing, and in the larger centres they seem to feel that a second station in a large city, or in medium-sized cities -- whatever the case may be -- providing that the station is prepared to finance, is a good thing. We are always talking about the lack of money and this would be one way of getting another station, but they would still be under the control of the regulatory body, or whatever body we have.

THE CHAIRMAN: If the Order feels competition is a good thing, why on earth do you make the recommendation that the national network should refuse all local commercial business?

MRS. DETWILER: I didn't make that recommendation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, on page 6.

MRS. DETWILER: Well, simply for this reason -- yes, I did, but for this reason, that the livelihood of the private stations is more or less determined by the business with the advertising and so on it gets. It has not a grant from the Government to assist the finances -- that is, an independent station has not. Therefore, that we would not consider going into a centre, or the C.B.C. would not consider going into a centre where there is a local station that will advertise local products

and advertise local business.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am perhaps only teasing you, but it is that competition is a good thing up to a point, then?

MRS. DETWILER: Yes; well, there are always exceptions to many things.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And this alternate station would be completely independent of the C.B.C. for programmes, or would it buy programmes from the C.B.C.? How would it operate?

MRS. DETWILER: That will have to be left to better brains than mine.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I am just trying to find out if, in your opinion, this new station in a medium-sized or large centre would be dependent to a certain extent on C.B.C. programmes?

MRS. DETWILER: I should think it would. It would come under the same control that controls C.B.C. and controls any other independent station.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Would it receive programmes from the C.B.C. network?

MRS. DETWILER: Well, I should think that an arrangement would be made whereby it would receive the programmes that should be given over the air for reasons that we have always applied in connection with the C.B.C. We have looked on the C.B.C. as the cultural body of radio and telecasting.

THE CHAIRMAN: But these are second stations. Let us take the C.B.C. station in Toronto;

this recommendation, apparently, is that the other channel available in Toronto should be opened up to private people who are willing to put up the money for it and operate it?

MRS. DETWILER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the C.B.C. programme, the cultural or other programmes, are already coming into Toronto: What does the other station operate on?

MRS. DETWILER: Well, I should think it would work with the control body just the same. I am not in favour of stations preparing all its programmes. I think it should have some leeway, but I am not in favour of it preparing all its own programmes, and certainly it should carry some of the national programmes which have been prepared.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you would not want two stations at precisely the same time to be carrying the national programme in the same area?

MRS. DETWILER: Well, I personally would not object to that because when that programme is over, if people are listening to it, they switch and they get another set of programmes which would not be carried on the C.B.C. station.

MR. de GRANDPRE: It has been suggested to us -- and we will have to verify the figures we were given -- that in order for the C.B.C. to supply some programmes to another station it would cost a certain amount of money; there is no doubt about that. The exact figure we will have to go into, but

assuming it will cost some money, this money will not be available to established television stations at points which are not yet served by the C.B.C. or by television, and would you say that alternate stations should be licensed immediately even at the risk of retarding the development of television network for a larger proportion of the Canadian people?

MRS. DETWILER: I think our recommendation meant this, that the situation be reviewed now. You cannot do these things in five minutes or tomorrow, but that it should be reviewed now and that this be taken into consideration.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I ask a question on that: I don't say this is so -- we are reviewing it to some extent, and this is put to us and we must review this; you are talking about a private second station financed by private means, and the point Mr. de Grandpre has raised with you about programmes being supplied which might be a public cost, suppose apart from that the economics of the situation were such that the private owners in order to have a successful private venture would have to depend almost entirely upon American programmes to operate. Would you regard this as a bad thing or be concerned about it in your organization at all, or not?

MRS. DETWILER: Well, I understand that at the present time C.B.C. actually provides about 50% Canadian programmes, and then they get their other programmes from elsewhere.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is right.

MRS. DETWILER: Certainly we would not want an avalanche of programmes coming from another country -- not to pick out the United States.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it only happens to be the nearest one, that is all.

MRS. DETWILER: Yes, but I think there is real value in some of the programmes that we are getting, and to come back to the regulatory body, if anything happens about it, somebody would be reviewing the programmes, and in the case of this independent station I should think in co-operation with the regulatory body. There would have to be some control, I am perfectly willing to admit that.

THE CHAIRMAN: That was really my question, as to whether or not you recognized the fact that some control may be necessary?

MRS. DETWILER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have only one other question on which you may be able to give us some help. You used the phrase a moment ago that the C.B.C. was regarded as being responsible for the cultural type of programme, and that is a word that sometimes gets misunderstood or criticized. We were given an interesting submission in Vancouver that culture should be interpreted in a very wide way to include, as they put it, Barbara Ann Scott and Rocket Richard as well as Sir Ernest MacMillan and Lorne Harris; in a broad sense the whole make-up of Canadian life went into Canadian culture. However, on this more educational type and less entertaining type of

programme, could you give us any idea as to the degree to which people listen to them and are willing to listen to them? We have had all kinds of witnesses come before us and say nobody ever listens to the C.B.C.'s culture. Is this the fact, or isn't it?

MRS. DETWILER: I do not think it is a fact, Mr. Chairman. I am almost convinced that in the large metropolitan areas the programmes are not listened to. True, they have so many other cultural activities and so many other chances for cultural life, that that may be understood, but I am quite sure that in the outlying places -- I am thinking of the smaller towns, and so on -- they are listened to because I have heard people speak about them and comment on them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I assume that on page 5 of your brief you do talk about a number of these programmes which must have been the subject of comment as from your membership?

MRS. DETWILER: They were, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. This has been a helpful and interesting discussion.

---A short recess.

SUBMISSION OF CANADIAN MENTAL HEALTH
ASSOCIATION

APPEARANCES:

Dr. J.D. Griffin

Dr. Reva Gerstein, Ph.D.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we have is from the Canadian Mental Health Association, Dr. Griffin and Miss Gerstein -- Dr. Gerstein, consultant on programmes. We will make your exhibit 108.

EXHIBIT NO. 108: Brief of the Canadian Mental Health Association.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see you have been sitting in the room for a little while and could see how we are proceeding.

DR. GRIFFIN: I should by way of introduction, Mr. Chairman, simply indicate there are a few minor typographical errors in this. This was produced hurriedly in an effort to reach an approximate deadline for briefs -- we didn't quite make it -- and I will correct these as we go along, if you don't mind, and the other point I wanted to make before I read this brief is that we are concerned chiefly with content of programmes, not on administration.

The Canadian Mental Health Association, which is a national voluntary organization interested in mental health, with provincial divisions right across this country, through its National Scientific Planning Council begs me to request the Royal Commission's consideration of the following statements.

The first deals with the importance of radio and television in public education generally. Radio and television broadcasting are of major importance as national media for public education. Its significance will undoubtedly grow. For this reason policies and regulations established now concerning the use of these media and the nature of the content carried will have far-reaching effects on Canadian citizens. Not the least important of these effects are those related to mental health.

Television particularly has an impact on both visual and auditory perception which is arresting, authoritative, and personally intimate; it has more effect as a method of communication than any other known medium or device. Psychologically, its effect has been described at times as bearing on "hypnotic".

Television has changed the leisure time customs of society more radically than any invention since the motorcar. It provides a focus of collective, concentrated attention which is truly staggering. It is estimated that in Canada there are approximately 105 to 170 million hours a week spent on individual watching of television programmes. Children in some localities are reported to be spending as much time watching T.V. per week as they do in attending school.

Television seems to have replaced the radio as a focus of family activity. Instances of family viewing of televised programmes followed by informal family discussion have been reported from

all areas where television has been introduced. It apparently is being used in this way much more than radio ever was. Meanwhile radio seems to have moved out of the living-room into other rooms of the home and into the automobile where it is used mostly for individual listening.

From the above it is clear that while both radio and television are capable of influencing public opinion, changing attitudes and affecting action patterns of society quickly and effectively, television has a special potency and impact since it is at once so personally intimate and so related to family life.

Now, with reference to public education in mental health, mental and emotional illness in Canada is creating a health problem of staggering proportions. There are more than 65,000 patients in Canadian mental hospitals now with the annual increase in the number larger than can be accounted for by the increasing population and improved diagnostic and treatment facilities alone.

In spite of the existence of a body of scientific and technical knowledge relating to the effective care and treatment of patients suffering from mental illness, it is seldom possible to use this knowledge to the full because of, (a) inadequate and outmoded hospital and clinical facilities, (b) insufficient number of qualified professional staff, and, (c) insufficient funds for important basic and clinical research.

The principal reason why these difficulties

are more obvious in the mental health field than in other health fields is because traditionally there has been little real public concern. A true appreciation of the significance of mental illness has always been clouded by misconception, ignorance and apathy. When such illness strikes close by, the emotional impact is usually one of fear, horror, or disgrace.

Attempts to change public attitude and to develop an intelligent and sympathetic understanding of the problem have been constantly made by the Canadian Mental Health Association since its organization in 1918. The Association now is convinced that ordinary methods of education through public addresses and the printed word are relatively ineffective. The result is often the development in the community of a pattern of "denial and isolation" as a method of dealing with the threat of mental illness. The existence of abnormal behaviour is denied as long as possible. When this is no longer feasible, the degree of abnormality of mental illness is exaggerated with the result that the mentally ill person is isolated -- socially, conceptually and physically.

The Association believes that skilful and intelligent use of radio and television can change this attitude quickly. They can provide programmes in which the audience is involved and participates. They not only can create a favourable attitude to the problem of mental illness in others, they can do a great deal to help people understand themselves and their emotional make-up. It is at least possible to

conjecture therefore that these media may play their part in preventing individual mental and emotional breakdown. And by the same token the media, if unskilfully and unwisely used, can have a destructive and negative effect on public understanding of mental illness and even on individual mental health.

Now, with reference to the relationship between our Association and the broadcasting industry, the Canadian Mental Health Association has had considerable experience in advising and consulting with radio and television personnel with regard to the content of programmes. The General Director of the Canadian Mental Health Association has been retained for a number of years as a consultant in mental health and human relations programmes by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

The current series of mental health and human relations programmes carried on the Dominion network -- that is a radio programme -- were developed initially in close consultation with staff members of the C.M.H.A. An attempt has been made to evaluate the results of many of these programmes in all parts of the country. Programmes designed as "mental health" programmes such as "In Search of Ourselves" have had a variable impact. Predominantly regarded as useful and helpful programmes, it must be admitted that in parts of Canada, for example Nova Scotia and other eastern provinces, some of these programmes were thought to be definitely "anxiety-arousing".

Undoubtedly successful collaboration

between writers on the one hand and psychiatrists and social scientists on the other has frequently occurred with very successful results. For example, the radio series entitled, "The Ways of Mankind"; which I think is a very successful programme coming out of collaboration of this kind.

Most of the programmes designed for public education in the mental health field are regarded by the broadcasting industry as "public service" programmes. Occasionally private stations have been reluctant to carry these programmes because they feel their popular appeal is not great. The Association is convinced that it is perfectly possible to create programmes of good value for mental health education which are so appealing and generally interesting that there will be no hesitation about carrying them on "free time", as it is called. However, they should be good enough to attract commercial sponsors. In at least one instance the Association has collaborated with a commercial sponsor, and in this case it was an insurance company, to produce a radio programme series on the mental health of children. This carried the usual institutional type of advertising, provided a modest contribution to the Association and did an effective piece of public education.

Generally speaking, the Association has found the private stations very sensitive to their public service responsibilities and anxious to cooperate in providing sound programmes of public education value for mental health.

Now, at this point I would like to refer specifically to some examples of what we as psychiatrists, psychologists and social scientists interested in mental health feel are good programmes and some that are bad programmes. I suppose I may refer specifically to these programmes, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DR. GRIFFIN: Even with this experience, it must be admitted that it has been very difficult to predict accurately which programmes would have a "good" effect and which a "bad" effect with reference to mental health. This has been especially difficult to do when some sort of value judgment has had to be given before the programme is actually broadcast on the basis of perusal of the script alone. The best that can be attempted is usually a judicious guess.

Hindsight is always easier and after programmes have been produced the judgment as to which have been obviously "good" and which "bad" is usually clear enough.

Examples of undoubtedly good television programmes, and this is of course from the mental health standpoint, include the following from Canada, such programmes as "Window on Canada", especially some featuring mental health topics, produced by the National Film Board. I might point out that these films shown on television are always followed by discussion, by competent and informed people, which we feel is a very important added aspect and necessary added feature for programmes of this kind.

No. 2, "Exploring Minds", "Fighting Words", "Perspective", and some of the special dramas which have been prepared and produced in Canada featuring mental health programmes.

I think I should also refer in passing to some of the work that the programme "Tabloid" has done. A most amazing impact through interviews with informed and trained people about their field of operations, their field of work, and very recently "Tabloid" carried a visit to the Ontario Hospital at Whitby showing participation of the patients in a little drama that they put on in that institution, which was very effective.

From the United States come some programmes as recently the C.B.S. documentary "Out of Darkness", the "Ed Murrow Show" and his actuality show on a visit to a mental hospital, and the "You Are There" series. One especially showed the historical development of psychiatric treatment. Some of the "Medic" series. Several have featured psychiatric problems. Some of these are better than others, of course.

All of these programmes had positive value in the direction of building healthy attitudes, correcting misconceptions, giving specific information and deepening the human understanding on the part of the public with reference to mental illness.

Some examples of programmes which we feel to have a "bad" mental health effect are as follows: the Oral Roberts Evangelistic Services programme, claiming to be a religious programme showing spiritual

healing. This is not carried by the C.B.C., but is carried by private stations. We are particularly concerned about the impact of this programme.-- there may be others similar to it -- because of various factors which I can discuss later, but chiefly because of the possibility of stirring up emotional, even hysterical feelings on the part of people who view this programme.

Secondly, some of the T.V. dramas based on popular and sometimes quite incorrect conceptions of psychiatry and psychological interpretation of human behaviour, are morbid and frightening.

Sometimes inadvertently even good programmes have very bad features. For example, the Ed Sullivan Show some months ago had a comedian who sang a song entitled "I'm A Schizy Phreny". This was a burlesque on the behaviour of psychotic patients which was in poor taste and had an unfortunate impact on mental patients who were watching the programme, as well as relatives and friends.

Analyzing the negative impact of television programmes, we have been impressed with the fact that not only is psychiatry often misrepresented in dramas intended for entertainment, but some of the programmes seem to try to capitalize on the public's fascination with the evil, morbid and twisted patterns of psychopathic behaviour. Occasionally, the portrayal of mental hospitals and sanatoria in these dramas is very misleading, indicating that patients are badly treated or locked up when they should not have been, and so on. Physicians report that

following one of these programmes there is often an increase in telephone calls and visits to the office on the part of patients who have been disturbed and made worse by these programmes.

And now, some general conclusions. From the above it is clear that, in spite of considerable experience in applying psychiatric and psychological insight in the assessment of programmes, there is some doubt as to the correctness of this assessment. There is a great need for action research into the whole problem. What we are trying to say, Mr. Chairman, we are the first to admit we do not know all the answers. We know something of the power of television and urgency of the problem. But we need to have much more knowledge on exactly how television can be used to best advantage for mental health and for the sound development of Canadian citizens.

Money and facilities should be provided, (a) to underwrite the continued production of programmes of possible mental health value; (b) to provide for intensified collaboration and consultation between professionals in the television medium and professionals in the mental health field, (c) to provide for broadening and deepening the research effort in the creation, production and evaluation of these programmes.

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has a special responsibility to ensure that a similar programme of collaboration and research be developed for programmes in the French language. It is obvious,

of course, that findings with reference to the value of English programmes will mean little or nothing as far as the French-speaking part of Canada is concerned. Mental health programmes in French will have to be specially conceived and designed to take into account the different value systems and different culture milieu of French Canada.

Briefly in summary, these seem to be our points:

1. The growing significance and responsibility of radio and television broadcasting for public education is recognized. The very special, personal, intimate and concentrated impact of television is described with its capacity to affect attitudes and value judgments, as well as to impart information.

2. The growing problem of mental illness and increasing importance of mental health is described. The difficulties encountered in designing an effective programme of public education, are referred to. The possible progress which could be made if the potency of television were utilized skilfully in the mental health field is suggested.

3. The experience of the Canadian Mental Health Association in relation to broadcasting is described and the difficulty of predicting good and bad programmes is pointed out.

4. The need for closer and more continuous consultation and collaboration between professional mental health personnel and professional broadcasting personnel is underscored.

5. It is suggested that such a collaboration would make it possible to enhance the mental health value of programmes and protect the mental health of the citizens.

6. The urgency for immediate research in this whole area is cited -- research that is broad in scope, involving people trained in many fields including mental health, the social services and communications.

The significance and pertinence of all the above for private stations as well as public systems of broadcasting is assumed.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is fine.

MR. COYNE: Dr. Griffin, am I correct in thinking from your brief that your interest in radio and television programmes is really twofold? Firstly, you are interested in programmes of an educational nature, dealing specifically with problems of mental health; and secondly, are you also interested more broadly in programming in general, having in mind possible effect of programme content upon mental and emotional stability of listeners and viewers?

DR. GRIFFIN: That is correct.

MR. COYNE: There are those two aspects of your interest in this field?

DR. GRIFFIN: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Well, dealing with the broader one, do you feel that programming in general, or the programmes generally should be vetted or reviewed in some way to avoid any possibility that they may

reflect some harm upon some segments of the listening public?

DR. GRIFFIN: We have given this suggestion, of course, a very great deal of thought, and up until the moment we have not come forward and been able to suggest any way in which that could effectively be done. With reference to the script you will recall, to peruse a programme prior to its production -- this holds particularly for T.V. -- is almost impossible to say definitively whether it is going to be good or bad from our point of view. You can get a good idea, perhaps. You have an impression, but I at least have been wrong many times. But in certain programmes of a series type, such programmes as you all know -- I suppose since I have been mentioning it, I can go back to it -- the Oral Roberts Show is largely the same week after week after week. One doesn't have now to have much doubt, from our point of view, that next week is going to be the same, and that we would have some apprehension about this going on. So in that sense I think some control should be exercised.

MR. COYNE: But is what you are concerned, as you say in certain parts of your brief, about the effect of these programmes, of this or that thing, that they may have upon some segment of the audience, aren't you developing a concept that is rather akin to censorship?

Take the Ed Sullivan Show, for example. I did not see the one you referred to, but if this burlesque number was cleverly done and it was something

which could be appreciated by the deserving and intelligent segment of the audience, do you suggest it should necessarily be cut off the air entirely and not available to viewers because of some effect ---

DR. GRIFFIN: I believe that should not have been shown.

MR. COYNE: On what grounds?

DR. GRIFFIN: On the grounds that this was a ridicule of a serious illness which is affecting thousands of Canadian citizens and about which and around which are already very many negative attitudes and feelings.

THE CHAIRMAN: Assuming, Dr. Griffin, that it should not have been produced, what is the method of preventing it being produced?

DR. GRIFFIN: Well, in our communication with Ed Sullivan, we suggested that wherever a part of his programme dealt directly or indirectly with mental health or with mental illness, there were available in New York, where his show is produced, competent collaborators or consultants or professionals in this field. We mentioned several bodies, among them the National Association for Mental Health, our opposite number -- that would be only too delighted to give him advice on this.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are really working by the process in the sense of public education on the Ed Sullivan Show?

DR. GRIFFIN: How else?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the other method that

would seem to be suggested, I think, in Mr. Coyne's question, and perhaps in your brief, was the possibility that you might be arguing that they should be in some way censored.

DR. GRIFFIN: We have not discovered how that could be done. We understand those programmes come into the country without ever being seen before. You do not really know what is going to be on that programme.

THE CHAIRMAN: Apart from the mechanical problems of operating it, it is a pretty serious ---

DR. GRIFFIN: We are not in favour of over-all censorship. Would you like to speak to that further, Dr. Gerstein?

DR. GERSTEIN: We are quite aware of the fact, we would like to work on the individual basis that the last decision is with the person producing the programme. We also recognize if we set up a machine for censorship of mental health, we have set up machinery to censor everything on the air, and this is a dangerous method we do not want to fall into.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the point I wanted to bring out.

MR. COYNE: I suppose it might lead to the result that all programmes would have to be vetted from an influence point of view so that everything that comes over would be suitable to every mind of the audience.

DR. GRIFFIN: Naturally we are interested in mental health. We are convinced that mental

health, good mental health, is a very important core problem and concern for the citizens of our country. This is about the same kind of importance as good education, "again", would be.

MR. COYNE: Do you feel from your point of view you would place the emphasis, that is perhaps as between these two interests, upon the specific problems related to positive educational effort in this field, would that be more important in your mind than this broader interest in programming generally and its effects on the viewers?

DR. GRIFFIN: I think we have to keep our eye on the whole broad extent of radio and television broadcasting, and I do not think we could say we are interested only in the specific mental health education programmes, because there are so many examples of programmes that are not intended to be mental health programmes having a very serious impact or very serious effect. The same remark, of course, we freely admit can be made about films in our movie-houses.

MR. COYNE: You do not place the emphasis on one interest rather than another? I was not suggesting you were interested only in this.

DR. GRIFFIN: I suppose we would start with the top priority of those programmes that have specific mental health -- we certainly keep a broad view on the thing.

MR. COYNE: Turning to your brief for a moment, on page 2 where you are speaking of the

problem of public education and mental health. This rather arises out of the questions I was just asking you. You speak at the bottom of the page, in numbers 5 and 6, you say:

"The Association believes that skilful and
"intelligent use of radio and television
"can change the situation quickly."

The situation is that the public is apt to misunderstand.

"And by the same token the media if un-
"skilfully and unwisely used can have a
"destructive and negative effect on public
"understanding".

In those paragraphs, again, are you speaking with particular reference to specific programmes?

DR. GRIFFIN: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Of mental health education?

DR. GRIFFIN: Yes. You see, it is not brought out perhaps as clearly as I would have liked. now that I have had a chance to read it again, that we believe that change is necessary for the effective and efficient treatment of those who are mentally ill in our mental hospitals and so on, and it really cannot be made unless there is a very large body of public opinion demanding it, and that in turn cannot come about until there is a much better appreciation on the part of the public of the problem involved.

MR. COYNE: From your point of view it is in this field that television can play a very significant role?

Turning now to page 3, where you are describing the experience of your Association with the broadcasting industry, I take it from your paragraph 5 that you see no objection to commercial sponsorship of these mental health programmes?

DR. GRIFFIN: No.

MR. COYNE: It makes no difference?

DR. GRIFFIN: It is rather interesting to us that a very excellent documentary broadcast, a 90-minute broadcast from CBS, was carried by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and offered it to the private stations, I understand, but was actually carried only by one.

MR. COYNE: It was unsponsored?

DR. GRIFFIN: It was unsponsored. No, a commercial programme. I understand -- this is, I suppose, hearsay evidence -- that this programme was originally designed as a sponsored programme, and CBS hoped after producing it they would get a sponsor, and for some reason or other they could not.

After seeing the programme there seems to have been an increase in the interest on the part of commercial people in sponsoring programmes of that sort. This certainly was a programme that carried a terrific impact. It caused a great deal of public interest. I suggest that it may now be possible after one or two experiences of this kind to interest commercial people in sponsoring programmes as valuable as this one.

MR. COYNE: It may be easier to get the

sponsor the next time?

DR. GRIFFIN: Yes.

MR. COYNE: When you are dealing with those specific programmes on pages 4 and 5, you pointed out some which are, in your opinion, good and some which are, in your opinion, bad. Particularly with regard to those good ones, again are you thinking of those in terms of the specific treatment of mental health problems which they have dealt with on occasion, or are you thinking of programmes generally?

DR. GRIFFIN: This has to be divided. If I may just refer to them in order.

MR. COYNE: Yes.

DR. GRIFFIN: On the "Window On Canada" one, in general they are all good, but the ones that relate particularly to mental health are those films of the National Film Board which were called mental mechanism series, and others of that kind that bear directly or indirectly on mental health, as I said, and they were the ones we had in mind chiefly when we mentioned those particular programmes.

Now, "Exploring Minds" is about half and half. Half the time it deals -- and the same comment, by the way, holds for "Perspective" -- part of the time they are dealing with social and mental health problems, almost on a documentary level, public instruction level, and other times they go off into other aspects of living in Canada, that do not relate directly to mental health, but they have this indirect relationship of which I spoke. American sources

here I think are all related directly to mental health.

MR. COYNE: One further question that arises out of your general conclusions and your summary, on page 5 you say money and facilities should be provided to underwrite the continued production of programmes of possible mental health value, and to provide for collaboration and consultation between professionals in the television medium and professionals in the mental health field, and to provide for broadening and deepening the research effort in the creation, production and evaluation of these programmes.

And then in the summary, 4, 5 and 6, you again speak of the urgency of immediate research in this whole area. My question is this: The C.B.C. is essentially a broadcasting agency, and its funds are provided for that purpose. Do you feel that it is part of C.B.C.'s task to undertake the financial burden of initiating specialized research into these problems, or is it not more a question of a body such as yourselves financing and doing research and studies, and then through appropriate liaison with the C.B.C., endeavour to have your results incorporated into their programmes? In other words, how much money do you think the C.B.C. should put up in this rather specialized research field?

THE CHAIRMAN: If any?

DR. GRIFFIN: You have touched on a point that is an important one. I should admit right off the bat the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation had some years ago now actually invited us to do a research

study on certain programmes relating to children. Actually it was the effect of so-called crime programmes on children, which the Canadian Mental Health Association carried out on the request of the C.B.C., and in this instance it was financed by the C.B.C. It was not a very elaborate programme or it was not a very expensive one, and we were glad to work the thing through.

Generally speaking, the Canadian Mental Health Association is not itself a research body. We are vitally interested in research and would be very delighted to undertake to organize research in the sense of making sure that appropriate people, appropriate centres, appropriate facilities -- universities chiefly -- and so on were made available providing we had the money.

This is one of our great difficulties at the moment. We do not have a national research fund for mental health yet. I am quite certain within a few years we shall have, but in the meantime this cannot wait. In the meantime, I believe that either through our Organization or directly with the universities, research should be carried on. How it is financed is an academic matter.

I understand the C.B.C. has already made -- has taken steps in this direction. You do have a research department. It is already interested in -- I do not know whether you are the C.B.C. -- I will say "it" -- it is already interested in social science research. The C.B.C. already has some very excellent

topnotch Canadian scientists engaged in that, and we are suggesting it is an excellent start but it is too little.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is surely a difference between the C.B.C. for its own purposes or a private broadcasting station for its own purposes, to find out something about a specific programme or series of programmes or line of policy, asking for and properly paying for research. That must be different to the kind of over-all research into the problems of ---

DR. GRIFFIN: Well, it overlaps, Mr. Chairman. Let's take an example. Supposing we go back to the series of radio programmes called "In Search of Ourselves". Supposing the C.B.C. might wish to find out what the impact of this was in a certain area of Canada. Surely one of their interests is, what effect, what measureable effect anyway, does this have on mental health insofar as it was originally designed to affect mental health?

MR. COYNE: That is precisely what I mean, on a specific thing such as that, as to broadcasting, the impact of a programme or series of programmes. Yes. But you are talking about a great need for action, research into this whole programme.

DR. GRIFFIN: Of communication. Television, radio communication with reference to mental health, yes. Perhaps this is not something that the C.B.C. should undertake by itself. But it seems to me that it has leadership, responsibility, here. Perhaps along with an organization such as our own

or Canadian Medical Association or other interested groups to point this up and encourage the sources of money such as the Federal Government, for example, to spend much more money than they are presently spending on research of this kind.

MR. COYNE: Well, let me put it this way, and it might simplify the question. You said the Canadian Mental Health Association was not essentially a research organization. You are not suggesting that the C.B.C. should become essentially a research organization and it should of its own volition find within its limited resources a very significant sum of money which, presumably, research in this and other fields would require to be properly done?

DR. GRIFFIN: I should think it might be better.

MR. COYNE: It is a matter of emphasis.

DR. GRIFFIN: Yes, I see your point, and I think it is a good point; but at the same time the C.B.C. or broadcasting, including those private stations, broadcasting professionals together with social scientists and psychiatrists could work out areas of importance for significant research which then the appropriate bodies, including our organization and the C.B.C. and perhaps the Association of Private Stations, could jointly approach foundations, governments, whoever has the money, and say to them, "Here, this needs to be done". We do not know what the answers are, we have got to find out as quickly as possible.

MR. COYNE: You say in effect they should co-operate together and that the broadcasters should take an interest and play some part in furthering it? Is that a fair summary?

DR. GRIFFIN: Yes, I would go along with that.

MR. COYNE: Those are all my questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you both very much. You realize, of course, that your submission is on a specialized point in our inquiry and does not cover the field, and it may well be that the particularity and nature of the programme will have to light outside of our jurisdiction, but the general thought is a valid and good one to have in mind.

DR. GRIFFIN: If you wish to ask something about psychologists ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Do we have a psychologist here?

DR. GRIFFIN: You have her right here.

THE CHAIRMAN: The statement was made in the preceding brief -- you may have heard it -- that psychologists and educators are becoming more concerned with television's possibilities for evil than they are impressed with its possibilities for good.

DR. GERSTEIN: I do not think I would go along with that one, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would not?

DR. GERSTEIN: No.

DR. GRIFFIN: Psychiatrists would not either, really.

SUBMISSION OF THE BUREAU OF BROADCAST MEASUREMENT.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. C.R. Vint

Mr. H.M. Stovin

Mr. A.T. Gamble

Mr. C.H. McDonald

Mr. C.J. Follett.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we are to have is the brief of the Bureau of Broadcast Measurement. Mr. Vint is President, and Mr. Stovin is Vice-President, and I do not know whether Mr. Gamble and Mr. McDonald are here or not. I understand Mr. C.H. McDonald, Research and Development Director, will present the brief, and you have Mr. Vint, Mr. Gamble and Mr. Follett with you?

MR. McDONALD: That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will mark your brief as Exhibit 109.

EXHIBIT NO. 109: Brief of The Bureau of Broadcast Measurement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Please feel free to sit down. Now, I am going to suggest in this one case that since we did not have your brief -- I do not know whether it was your fault or in shipping from Ottawa -- we have not had an opportunity to read this brief as we have in almost every other case so far, and therefore I think you had better read this brief.

MR. McDONALD: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: And also, since time is going on, we will just have to see where we are at the time you are finished reading, and possibly leave the questions over until after lunch, or we will possibly be able to finish this morning.

MR. McDONALD: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it will take long to read it.

Mr. Chairman, we believe it is important for the Royal Commission on Broadcasting to have in its records an outline of the part played by the Bureau of Broadcast Measurement in the broadcasting and advertising industry.

The Bureau of Broadcast Measurement is a non-profit co-operative organization for the standardization and analysis of facts about radio and television. It was formed in 1942 through the joint efforts of the Association of Canadian Advertisers, The Canadian Association of Broadcasters (now the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters) and the Canadian Association of Advertising Agencies.

At the time of its formation there was an urgent need for a standard form of coverage estimate for radio broadcasting outlets in Canada. Before B.B.M. studies the coverage or circulation of radio stations had been estimated on such bases as contour lines, mail pull and similar unsatisfactory means. As a result the three levels of the advertising industry -- the advertiser, the advertising agency and the broadcasting station -- joined forces to formulate

an independent and impartial organization which would do actual field surveys using an agreed upon standardized method. By this means it was hoped that coverage figures would be accepted and would be standardized throughout the industry in Canada. In this case, the advertising and broadcasting industry.

The Bureau of Broadcast Measurement has grown consistently since its first coverage study in 1944. Since that first survey a study has been completed every two years, the last one taking place early in 1956 -- the seventh in the series.

To assure impartiality and to assure that each level of the industry had a voice in B.B.M.'s policies, from the outset the Board of Directors was composed of representatives from advertiser, agency and radio station. Since B.B.M. has entered the television field in 1956, our Board now consists of four advertisers, four representatives from advertising agencies, four from radio stations and four from television stations. We have attached to our submission a list of the the directors and research committee members of the B.B.M. Over the course of B.B.M.'s history and development we have been extremely fortunate in securing the voluntary services of many of the outstanding minds in the advertising industry. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation joined B.B.M. at the time of its first survey in 1944, and had a voice in B.B.M.'s policies through continued representation on B.B.M.'s Board of Directors. However, C.B.C. discontinued its membership in B.B.M. at the

end of 1955.

As of the present time B.B.M. counts in its membership 139 private radio stations, out of the 156 stations now on the air -- or 89% of all stations. The membership also includes 71 advertising agencies of the 88, by the way, in Canada, 43 of Canada's larger advertisers, and 15 radio and television station representatives. This strength of membership we believe testifies to the acceptance of, and need for, validated and standardized data in measuring the audience of radio and television stations.

In 1956, as a result of urgent requests from the agency and advertiser as well as the television station, B.B.M. commenced the measurement of television coverage in Canada and received the immediately direct support of 22 of the 25 presently broadcasting private television outlets -- or 79% of the total. For your convenience, we have also attached a list of our members as an appendix to the submission.

During the course of the past two years the Bureau of Broadcast Measurement has employed a full-time research and development director. The purpose of this appointment was to further the basic objectives of the organization in refining presently available statistics on coverage and, even more important, to do basic research in the other aspects of the broadcast audience, which is so urgently needed in Canada today.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mind if I interrupt you here? When you are talking about statistics

on coverage and measurement of audience, are you talking in terms of the physical scope to which a station can effectively reach, or are you talking about the number of sets turned on?

MR. McDONALD: There are two facets, Mr. Chairman. Coverage is one facet, and it infers all the outlets, meaning all the number of households which tune to a station, over a broad period of time such as, say, a given week. This would be called coverage. They tune in at least once a week, so that this gives a potential of the station, and if for instance a station carried a programme which was of ultra high interest, that is potentially all the stations within its coverage, all the households in its coverage could tune.

THE CHAIRMAN: But your word "coverage" is basically a physical or mechanical thing rather than a matter of choice?

MR. McDONALD: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just was not sure. Go ahead.

MR. McDONALD: One small thing, on the other hand you have a rating field which measures the precise, or shall we say attempts to estimate the number of households or individuals, depending on what you are measuring, number of households let us say tuned to a specific programme at a specific period.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would have been the proper way to phrase my question. You used "coverage" as being different from the rating system.

MR. McDONALD: Yes, we have only up-to-

date engaged in estimated coverage.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see.

MR. McDONALD: As a result, B.B.M. has developed a new technique of the over-all measurement of broadcast audiences by half-hour periods. In other words, we have developed a technique which is economically and visibly sound to measure programmes, or let us say half-hour periods of audiences more specifically than just by coverage. We are now entering the specific ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Rating?

MR. McDONALD: Yes. The specific kind you mentioned, that is co-incident with the introduction of our time period audience system.

This new method holds great promise in clearing away much of the doubt and confusion which has existed around the programme rating field for the past fifteen years. The new technique has been called Time Period Audience and was accepted unanimously by the combined membership of B.B.M. at its 1956 annual meeting here in Toronto.

Plans are now underway to do two national Time Period Audience studies each year and the membership have directed that the first of these studies be implemented as soon as possible, preferably in the fall of 1956.

One of the most cogent evidences of support of B.B.M.'s over-all programme, its basic principles of impartiality and high quality research, has been the remarkable growth in membership since the beginning

of 1956. Since January we have had 16 additional private radio stations join the organization, bringing the membership up to the 139 private radio broadcasters mentioned above. As a footnote we would like to add that most of the cost of B.B.M.'s surveys is borne by the radio and television broadcasters, with a contribution by advertiser and advertising agency being a small proportion of total receipts. At the same time, however, advertisers and agencies have an equal voice with the broadcasters in determining the policies of the organization. Our purpose in appearing before you is to indicate the existence of our organization in the hope that it demonstrates how the three levels of the advertising industry have banded themselves together voluntarily towards what is a vital and worthy cause -- standardized and validated research in the broadcast media.

We have clear evidence that stations have found B.B.M. coverage data invaluable in planning their programming and services to their communities. With the advent of the Time Period Audience System, planning can be even more specific. On the advertiser's side our efforts are directed towards the best possible assessment of the audience to the broadcast media, so that advertising dollars can be spent with optimum efficiency.

Finally, the generous contribution in terms of many hours of meetings, travel and co-operation of senior executives supports the contention that the advertising industry is able to assess and make

notable progress in solving one of the most difficult and tenuous of all problems -- that of broadcast media research.

(Page 2597 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: Just one question, again on the meaning of terms: I don't want to get into the detail of this Time Period Audience system, but when you have it are you, in effect, measuring the total size of the audience or are you in any way forming any judgment of the quality of the programme?

MR. McDONALD: We are doing a simple quantitative job. My own feeling, and I believe I reflect the feeling of our Board of Directors and the Research Committee, is that at the moment before we get into an assessment of the quality aspects of radio broadcasting, we need badly a quantitative -- just a simple flat "how many?". We don't even have them at the moment because it is such a problem.

THE CHAIRMAN: But it is particularly advantageous from the advertising point of view?

MR. McDONALD: Advertising, yes, and programming from the station side.

THE CHAIRMAN: To the extent that programming from the station side is directed toward maximizing the audience.

MR. McDONALD: But let us not say it is wholly for advertising dollars. There is also the aspect of public service which the station is very interested in, and which must be balanced, I think, along with this.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is, really, the contention made by someone yesterday, who said they would be prepared to contend that it may be in an over-all way more important for a programme to be

received by 5,000 than for another programme to be received by 5 million.

MR. McDONALD: I think there are so many conditions and qualifications, that to make a statement of that kind you would have to be quite specific.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am using extreme cases, and they were too, but your technique of Time Period Audience system, as you say, does not go into the quality and probable value of the supply of programmes to a minority group?

MR. McDONALD: No. There is one aspect of it which, as we go along, I think is coming now from our research progress. We will attempt to get some estimate of audience composition, and some on in-home and out-of-home listening so that programmes designed for the motorist featuring safety or traffic or items of particular interest to men can be put on the air at times which will give the maximum audience, but our whole thesis is that you have to walk before you can run. We have to get a firm quantitative assessment, because up to date in Canada there are no means of getting the audience on two stations for any period. There are certainly measures in specific city areas, but there are no estimates, for instance, in the rural areas, and this, we hope, will give us a solution to that quantitative problem.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I don't know if I understood your explanation correctly. The first step that is being taken is to establish what is the radius of good reception, for instance?

MR. McDONALD: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Then you go one step further and say what is the radius of good reception and what is the radius of poor reception for any given station; is that the way you try to base your calculations?

MR. McDONALD: No, we make no valuation on good or poor; we simply say, "In this area so many households are tuned".

THE CHAIRMAN: Tuned? Or so many households with radios and televisions existing?

MR. McDONALD: I am sorry.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I think we will have to define our words first. When I say "coverage" I have in mind the quantity of sets in any given area. Let us take it from a practical point of view: You have an area where there is a television station and you want to know how many television sets are in this area served by this particular television station?

MR. McDONALD: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: The first step to take would be to establish what is the radius of coverage of that station, I take it; am I correct?

MR. McDONALD: There are two ways, and this is a difficult problem: First of all, there is the length or distance to which the electromagnetic waves travel, but there is also a secondary factor, do the people who own sets within that physical limitation ever tune to that station.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Isn't that another

aspect of the problem altogether -- the number of sets tuned in?

MR. McDONALD: Yes, that is the one -- our interest is secondary in the physical number of sets. We are more interested, as you can see in the last explanation, in the number of T.V. households covered by a given T.V. station. This is a T.V. station report, Division No. 1: Saskatchewan, we estimate 10,600 households ---

MR. de GRANDPRE: This is the station report?

MR. McDONALD: Yes, Station Report.

MR. COYNE: We just have CKNX, Winnipeg.

MR. McDONALD: Let us use "X" County, and we have 10,000 households in that county, and we have 50% of those households with television, or, 5,000 television households. We find of that 5,000, say only 4,000 of them tune to Winnipeg, and the others tune to CFBL, which would be one of the coverage areas there. Another one would be the Kitchener station, and so on. Our major function is to determine how many households tune during a given week to given stations, not how many sets there are, although that is important to television.

MR. de GRANDPRE: How do you get the figure of the number of sets?

MR. McDONALD: That is estimated by a scientifically designed job which is done by mail. In January we sent out 100,000 questionnaires to a random sample of households throughout Canada, and we got them back, and on these questionnaires they

indicated to which television station they tune, after indicating whether they did or did not have a television set in their household. This would allow us to estimate how many television households there were in, say, each county and to what stations the owners tune. This will give us the potential for any television or radio station.

May I go on; I would like to explain slightly. The course of B.B.M. has been gradually building towards better measurement, and we have found that flat coverage figures of this type do at times lend themselves to misinterpretation. In other words, we find that advertising agencies or stations have in the past assumed that there is some loyalty factor connected with these estimates of coverage. These coverage figures say only that a household tunes to a given station once a week or oftener. It says nothing about a specific programme, and you have outstanding cases of any station, C.B.C. or other, which carries a programme of exceptionally high interest; let us say the station is in Toronto and it is a programme which is of keen interest and everyone has tuned in even though they normally listen to, say, Sudbury, and they tune in for one day and then go back to stations in their own locale. Therefore, the stations in Toronto, or any area which has one programme or two of particularly high interest, can get an abnormally high coverage figure.

THE CHAIRMAN: Which can be misinterpreted.

MR. McDONALD: Precisely, and that is why we are departing from the old idea of a circular or coverage over a whole week period, but try to assess coverage during specific half-hour periods, specific ones, so that this misinterpretation is eliminated.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I don't know whether this is a top secret procedure that you are following, but if it is you will tell me that I am not entitled to get the answer, but you are referring to a new method which I understand is the method you have summarily described, and you say that it is different from the contour lines or mail poll and similar unsatisfactory means; the mail poll, I understand, is what they call fan mail, but what is the contour lines method?

MR. McDONALD: The contour line is an engineering type of measurement. I am not an engineer in the electronics field, but, as I understand it, around each station there will be a line at which the electrical engineers have determined that the strength of the signal along this line is at a certain level, a constant level, say, half a millible, and the same thing applies to A B and C contours of a television station. Along these lines the signal is of equal strength measured in terms of mere electromagnetic unit. I may not be expressing it quite correctly, but it is not an audience measurement. It is an engineering measurement. I hope I am correct in that. You can understand the difficulty we would get into. First of all, it is my understanding that in T.V.

stations the contour lines will change from hour to hour and from day to day and from week to week during the year, and the measurements by contour lines are often measured before the station is on the air. The contour line has little meaning in terms of how many people are listening to any given programme.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is a purely electronic measurement?

MR. McDONALD: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Once you have gathered all these results, to whom are they made available -- only to your own members, or are they made available to any advertiser who would like to know beforehand, or has he got to be a member before applying for the results that you have gathered?

MR. McDONALD: We have a very open-door policy. We would be delighted to feel that all stations in the country were members of the B.B.M. Almost all advertising agencies do subscribe to our service because they find it is a standard limit of coverage, and we hope will be the standard limit for the half-hour.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you publish reports for general public information?

MR. McDONALD: No, they are made available to our members. If we published them generally it would be uneconomical for our members to pay large sums to get them. We would not have any members then.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know. Some people

do that.

MR. McDONALD: Our operation is rather expensive.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Just a last question: Do you happen to know why the C.B.C. discontinued its membership at the end of 1955?

MR. McDONALD: We have considerable correspondence with the C.B.C. on this. Generally, I believe it was due to the fact that C.B.C. felt that coverage statistics which had been produced by B.B.M. were inadequate to meet the needs of C.B.C. planning and they also felt it has not always been as productive of results as they would like to have. I believe the main thing was that the C.B.C. felt that the figures produced by B.B.M. were inadequate to their needs and that they also had reservations about the methods and techniques which we were at that time employing. I had the same reservations, but now we have changed, I believe -- as I say, our door is very open, and we would welcome the C.B.C.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was their thinking that, since they felt your then coverage of the subject was inadequate that they would have to do some of this themselves? Has it been the attitude, "You are not doing enough for us; we will have to put in a department to do this ourselves"?

MR. McDONALD: That would be, I think, something the C.B.C. would have to answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: You don't know whether they are in fact engaged in this coverage and other

coverage?

MR. McDONALD: We know they have -- of course, their Audience Research Bureau, I believe it is called,-- Bureau of Audience Research, and the head of that was a director in our organization; but, as to their own plans, I would rather you ask the C.B.C.

MR. de GRANDPRE: All your surveys are made by mail, or are some made by telephone calls or other means?

MR. McDONALD: Let me put it this way: Our research efforts are by all possible ways. We make personal calls, telephone calls, and we use mail, and through the combination of these research results we have determined that the mail technique for the type of survey we take -- and let me not leave the impression that I believe mail-type studies are adequate for all kinds of research -- but for the specific variable which we are studying we have determined to our own satisfaction, and with checking with other statistical experts, that the mail-type questionnaire will give us an unbiased and adequate estimate of audiences of stations for half-hour periods. Research, of course, continues all the time on this.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. As you said in your brief, you are merely recording with us that this organization exists. There is nothing particularly that you are recommending in the field of research in general, and that is all we have to ask you now.

---The hearings adjourned at 1.05 P.M. until 2.30 P.M.

---On resuming at 2.30 P.M.:

SUBMISSION OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
MUSICIANS
of the
UNITED STATES AND CANADA

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we will start now.
The first brief we are to hear is from the Federation
of Musicians. Mr. Murdoch, we will begin by marking
your brief Exhibit 110.

EXHIBIT NO. 110: Brief of The American Federation
of Musicians of the United States
and Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know that you were
here this morning, Mr. Murdoch, when we opened and
I was talking about our procedure. So as far as
the presentation of the brief is concerned we hope
you will make a presentation of it either by reading
it or by outlining it in summary form. After that
we will deal with you as we have with all other
briefs that have been presented, ask questions which
are designed solely for the purpose of bringing out
the facts that appear to be related to this inquiry;
but, necessarily, since you are the only witness
before us at the moment the questions will be for
the purpose of bringing out the facts, and you
should not read into them any conclusions at all.
They are merely to get at the facts.

So will you proceed?

MR. MURDOCH: We have prepared a summary of
the brief. We will read that and it will save
time.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we have all read the

brief, but I think it is desirable to have a fairly good outline of what the contentions are and what the facts are.

MR. MURDOCH: We will read the summary which I have at the back of my brief.

"In the beginning of the submission we point to the very vital interests that the musicians have in the 'health, quality and scope of broadcasting'. We outline to you something of the structure of our Federation in Canada, with its 32 locals and membership now approaching 14,000. And point out that although most of the musicians heard on radio and seen or heard on television are members of the Federation, only a very few can enjoy the benefits of a steady living through broadcasting. Other sources of employment are relatively small and unreliable, so that only four or five hundred professional musicians in this country make their full-time living from music, not only from broadcasting but from all sources.

"We point out, too, that this Federation is extremely concerned, as it has been for years, about what we call the incursions of electronics into professional music. The profusion of phonograph records heard on the radio is one example of this.

"We also express our concern over the tendency to concentrate musical talent in major production centres.

"We further deplore the lack of musical opportunity in the non-CBC stations in this country, pointing out that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in 1955 spent nearly eight times as much on live musical employment for Canadian performers as did the privately owned stations. Our records show that among the 153 private radio stations employment to member musicians in 1955 from only 37 is reported; from the 17 private television stations in operation for the full year of 1955 employment was reported from only seven.

"In the brief the Federation expresses deep concern with the undiminishing tendency of private radio and television stations to depend to the greatest possible degree on transcribed and filmed material, thus depriving our national talent of much of its legitimate employment. On page seven we do cite some exceptions to the rule among private radio and television stations -- that is to say, stations which do provide a reasonable measure of employment to musicians. We wish to call these to your attention.

"We ask the Commissioners to 'take a long and searching look' at the requests of private broadcasters before recommending that additional privileges be given to them. We question whether now they are living up to their community responsibility.

"We ask for a genuine attempt to broadcast more Canadian talent, either live or recorded in Canada, by both private and CBC stations. We raise the question -- only for study and not necessarily as a recommendation -- of greater protection of some kind, perhaps in the form of tariffs, for the production industry in Canada. To extend this, we wonder whether 'encouragement' through some device is not more desirable than 'protection' in the old-fashioned sense.

"We do ask that the Commission take a close look at the enforcement, or lack of it, of broadcast regulations. We also suggest that the private stations should be required to report their activities, as well as their financial status and their profits, for public scrutiny. We ask whether it would not be wise to require all Canadian stations to set aside a fixed minimum of gross revenues for live talent.

"We ask that enforcement of CBC regulations be separated from the Station Relations Branch, where it is now vested. And finally we ask that the wretched facilities for radio and television to be found in Toronto, and found in a lesser degree, in certain other cities, be replaced with something worthy of the national system of broadcasting.

"We call your attention to the summary of our recommendations on pages 14 and 15 of our

submission."

THE CHAIRMAN: I think, as I read your brief a few days ago, you have covered the highlights of it. Do you wish to add anything at this time to that?

MR. MURDOCH: No, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to add anything, Mr. McMaster?

MR. McMASTER: Well, I would like to produce this article for the attention of the Commission with regard to the allegation concerning the incursions of recorded music and electronics. It supports that statement.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will mark that as Exhibit No. 110-A, if we may keep it.

MR. McMASTER: Yes, you may keep it.

EXHIBIT NO. 110-A: The article referred to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne will have some questions. Usually we ask our counsel to ask some questions, but he doesn't get far before we ask them, too.

MR. COYNE: Turning to your brief, if you will, on page 1 you outline in summary form the organization of the American Federation of Musicians of the United States and Canada. You point out that there are 32 locals of the Federation in Canada which are autonomous units, and you say they send their own delegates to the annual convention of the Federation.

Is there a separate Canadian convention, or is that the annual convention of the whole ---

MR. MURDOCH: It is an annual convention.

MR. COYNE: Is that ever held in Canada?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes, it has been. If we had hotel accommodation that would be here next year.

THE CHAIRMAN: I expect to see you in Montreal any day now!

MR. COYNE: Then, you point out that the constitution of the Federation requires that at least one member of the executive board be a Canadian living in Canada. Would you tell us how many members there are on the executive board?

MR. MURDOCH: Five.

MR. COYNE: Of whom one is the Canadian member?

MR. MURDOCH: We think that is an equal proportion.

MR. COYNE: Will you tell us about the jurisdiction of the executive board? What sort of decisions does the executive board of the Federation make as distinct from the decisions that the autonomous locals make?

MR. MURDOCH: One is on national issues and the other is on local issues.

MR. COYNE: A little further on you speak of network broadcasting. The Federation has agreements with the CBC covering both radio and television. Are these national agreements, or are they ---

MR. MURDOCH: Canadian agreements.

MR. COYNE: Whom were they negotiated by?

MR. MURDOCH: By CBC and myself.

MR. COYNE: On behalf of --- ?

MR. MURDOCH: On behalf of Canadian locals. We have representations from Vancouver to Halifax to send to the conference.

MR. COYNE: So in addition to the executive body of the whole federation there is some Canadian central body, is there?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes. We have conferences twice a year, one eastern and one western, and the big convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not know that this matters, but is it one overall agreement with CBC under your jurisdiction or is it ---

MR. MURDOCH: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is one?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not separate locals that are working with separate stations?

MR. MURDOCH: No.

MR. COYNE: Well, just to clarify it, if you will, on the previous page you say you have --

" . . . autonomous units which elect their own officers and set their own rates and conditions of employment . . . "

Will you explain what rates and conditions of employment the locals set as in contradistinction to this national agreement?

MR. MURDOCH: On the matter of national broadcasting, or television, or the recording

industry in Canada they would be made for all the locals; but employment and appointments in Montreal, or in Halifax, would be negotiated by the local people.

MR. COYNE: What about in the case of local radio and television stations?

MR. MURDOCH: They do the same there, yes.

MR. COYNE: In your national contracts are the rates and conditions of employment the same across the country?

MR. MURDOCH: National employment in radio and television, yes. That is network radio. Do you understand that is network?

MR. COYNE: Yes, I think I do.

MR. MURDOCH: It is network. Where there is a network of the CBC there isn't any other network, so that network -- our local doesn't compete with it.

MR. COYNE: But if you are dealing with CBC purely in respect of your local radio station in Toronto ---

MR. MURDOCH: That is in the national agreement.

MR. COYNE: So that your agreement with the CBC covers all employment of musicians by the CBC whether on the network or for the local audience?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Then, just turning to page 3, if you would, you mention the M.P.T. Fund, which, you say, was established to collect royalties on records. Do I take that to mean royalties on the sale of records rather than on the performance?

MR. MURDOCH: On the sale of records, yes.

MR. McMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I have here the account of the trustees under that trust fund, if you would like to have that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me see it, will you, Mr. McMaster? I don't know how much we are going to go into it, but if we can have this copy it will be marked as Exhibit 110-B.

MR. McMASTER: Yes.

EXHIBIT NO. 110-B: The account referred to.

THE CHAIRMAN: We may want to have a look into it.

MR. McMASTER: It shows how the money is spent.

MR. COYNE: Another point following on that -- you mention that "to this fund later were added royalties on television films . . .". Is that, again, on the sale of television films?

MR. MURDOCH: Five per cent on the cost of the productions. It is royalty that is paid by the producers by agreement with the Federation.

MR. COYNE: But on the original production, not on the basis of the actual performance or showing of the film?

MR. MURDOCH: No, but if it is a multiple showing there is, of course, an additional fee.

MR. COYNE: But that is not a fee that goes into this fund?

THE CHAIRMAN: What page is that you are on?

MR. COYNE: Page three, Mr. Chairman, the first paragraph.

Then, turning to page 5, where you are speaking of the opportunities in broadcasting for the musicians you point out that the tendency is to programme for major centres, creating a force of gravity drawing the best musicians to the larger centres. What I would like to ask you is this: Isn't a tendency of that kind an inevitable development?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes, I would say so. I think the Commission might recommend that it be changed.

MR. COYNE: How do you think it could be changed, or counteracted, perhaps, would be a better word?

MR. MURDOCH: Well, there are groups, for instance, in Vancouver that do get some employment. They have some very fine musicians in Edmonton and Calgary. Catherine Parlow, probably one of the greatest Canadian violinists ever produced, was born there, and after travelling all around the world had to come back to Toronto to be employed. There is another very fine pianist there of outstanding merit who stays there because of family ties. There are other groups which could do a programme of a type consistent with -- we are not suggesting that everybody appear on CBC radio and television, but if they are up to programme standards I don't think it would hurt Montreal, Toronto or Vancouver if they were given an opportunity occasionally to go on a spot which might be carried on a regional

basis, or, if they happen to be outstanding, on a national basis.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think a case was put slightly differently somewhere in the West -- and I have forgotten at the moment who exactly did it -- but as I recall it it was that the regional centres, whether they are CBC or private stations, to some extent, perhaps, very frequently did give opportunities and desirable opportunities to young musicians and other artists; that this experience brought them along, but that they themselves required to move into greater training, more advanced instruction and experience which they really could only get in the larger centres; and I think the point was made that this was fundamentally a sound development, however much you might regret the concentration that was involved in it. But you can only have your higher centres of instruction in a few places, and they are the bigger and more populous places, and, necessarily, you are going to have this inflow to places like Toronto, Montreal and, perhaps, Vancouver; and that in those circumstances it would be a mistake to sort of swim against that tide.

What do you say to that?

MR. MURDOCH: Well, I say it is most unfortunate, because I don't think that talent, that the Canadian musician who has studied abroad -- and there are a number of them in the West -- should have to leave their home and their families and come into a rat race where competition is so keen as it is in Montreal and Toronto. I think some opportunity

should be given to them to be heard if they are worthy of being heard.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I think the point was made in Edmonton that they naturally gravitated to these larger centres because of the opportunities that were afforded them, and because the possibilities of frequent employment in these small places was naturally limited; so that the minute anyone reached a certain standard it was their ambition, which you couldn't stop, to get to these bigger centres. I think that was in Edmonton that that point was made.

MR. MURDOCH: There are, as a matter of fact, I think, 153 private stations in these centres. Why couldn't they give some employment to the local people in their town?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, of course, in Edmonton again it was brought out that they did, but the artists reached a standard of excellence that could command bigger money than could be paid in these smaller centres; so that the musicians themselves naturally gravitated into the bigger centres. I think that was the way it was put.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was the point that I made, that they would gravitate for quite a different reason than getting employment; they would gravitate for the purpose of getting better instruction.

MR. MURDOCH: Yes, I agree that is true. Take the City of Quebec, for instance. We have

very little folklore anywhere else in Canada than in Quebec City itself. We should cultivate that folklore. Next to Quebec is Newfoundland, which has some sea shanties. But in Quebec City itself, outside of Montreal, they have some very fine talent, and I think that a broadcast or television shot could be originated there.

THE CHAIRMAN: But as a practical man -- I think one could probably go along with the suggestion that an attempt should be made to put on Newfoundland sea shanties on a national hook-up or a regional hook-up of some kind -- but you don't suggest for a second that you are going to hold a really good musician in Newfoundland by employing him for this simple kind of service if he is good enough to get down for the better instruction and bigger things in one of the larger centres?

MR. MURDOCH: As evidence of my purity, we haven't any members in Newfoundland! I am talking as a Canadian and not as a member of the Federation.

THE CHAIRMAN: But I am asking you whether the notion of using these local special skills could -- as a practical man -- be used enough to hold a really good performer if they wanted better training, or else ---

MR. MURDOCH: Well, I had the owner of the television stations in to see me the other day -- discussing getting something for nothing -- and he told me a very interesting story, that they have

three American radio stations there with unlimited power that bring in ABC, NBC and CBS twenty-four hours a day, and that is why he has to compete against, besides other two private radio stations. He really has a problem. He presented his case very intelligently, and I am invited down there because they have seventy-five musicians who want to join the American Federation of Musicians.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just think that, however desirable decentralization of programming may be, there are certain broad, physical limitations. That is all I am suggesting.

MR. COYNE: Turning now to another point, on page 6 you are dealing with the amount of moneys spent by the private broadcasters and by the CBC on live talent, and in the case of the members of CARTB it was slightly over ten per cent of the total annual payroll as against 25.5 per cent in the case of the CBC. Wouldn't you think that a disparity of that kind -- to that extent -- is inevitable as long as the CBC enjoys a monopoly of network broadcasting and the economics of network syndicating are derived from private stations. The private stations might well say: "If the private stations could spread the cost over a series of outlets we would be in a different position from what we are now in"?

MR. MURDOCH: It would have some effect, but I think you should go a little higher up in the brief. The Canadian Association of Radio and

Television Broadcasters in their submission to the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects, stated that their member stations had an aggregate annual payroll of \$20 million. Of this, it was claimed, the talent cost on local live programmes came to "more than \$2 million in 1955". We say that that last figure sounds impressive, but it amounts to slightly over 10 per cent of the total payroll. We were wondering why more of that was not spent for live music. Now, that includes newscasters, sportscasters, announcers and "disc jockeys" and everything else.

MR. COYNE: If I follow you correctly, you are comparing that ten per cent for the CARTB with the 25.5 per cent of the CBC. The only point in my question was to ask you whether you would agree that some of the disparity, in any event, is caused by the fact that they do not have network facilities, and, therefore, are not able to spread the cost of producing live as distinct from recorded programmes over a larger market than merely the one-station basis.

MR. MURDOCH: That is true; but we are not happy at all about -- the private stations get CBC programmes, and in the case of commercial programmes get paid by them to use them, and the very fact that our product is being given to the private station without any remuneration to the musician who plays it has the effect of placing the musician in Calgary and Edmonton and in places like that in

the position that he stays at home and listens to the originating station feeding his, and they pay absolutely nothing for musicians.

MR. COYNE: That is a rather different point, and dealing with my previous question, you would agree that a disparity of that kind could be expected. I take it you are still saying that the private stations are not doing enough, but you do agree that some disparity might well arise out of their lack of that facility?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us take the musical programmes that are fed out through the CBC networks to private stations; it is part of the contract that they may so be fed, isn't it?

MR. MURDOCH: No, Mr. Chairman. In the matter of television our agreement with the CBC is that our television programmes would only go to CBC stations. We never consented to our television programmes being fed to anybody else. We did in radio, but not in TV.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us take the radio first. I was just on a slightly different point, that where the CBC produces a musical programme and puts it, let us say, on the Trans-Canada network, some of which is made up of private stations, those musicians are being paid according to their contract for that particular transmission.

MR. MURDOCH: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And to that extent the

private stations are carrying Canadian musical talent.

MR. MURDOCH: Yes.

MR. COYNE: I would like to revert to that topic a little later, but just before I do that there is a section of your brief on the extension of private broadcast facilities, having to do with additional television outlets.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where is that, Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: That is on page 8, Mr. Chairman. ' You say near the bottom of that page:

" . . . But the Royal Commission, and those responsible for determining the broadcasting policy of this country, should take a long and searching look at the plans and policies of those private broadcasters before such permission is granted."

I take it that you spoke before that of the use of "canned" or "preserved" material. I take it what you are saying there is that you fear the possibility that additional private TV stations would use almost exclusively "canned" material?

MR. MURDOCH: That is our experience.

MR. COYNE: You are really expressing there ---

MR. MURDOCH: Mr. Chairman, I have here a clipping from The Canadian Broadcaster and Television of April 19th, at the CARTB convention:

"Syndicated shows offer costly
talent below cost"--

and the article says:

"Syndicated radio programmes
are available to Canadian radio stations
for less than one per cent of the pro-
duction cost," he said, "adding that
the first source of supply is the
United States followed by the United
Kingdom and Australia . . ."

This is Mr. Gordon Peebles speaking, Vice-President
of S. W. Caldwell Limited.

I would like to present that as an exhibit,
if you will accept it.

-

-

(Page 2624 follows)

-

-

-

MR. COYNE: Turning to your recommendation, I think it is included in the back of the last section of your brief, but it also is dealt with on page 9, that some amount such as five per cent of the gross revenue be required to be set aside by the private broadcasters to be devoted to the hiring of live talent. Is your recommendation that such a figure as five per cent of the gross revenue be made a specific legal requirement?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes, that is what we are asking.

MR. COYNE: Might it not be necessary to grade the stations? I mean, I am thinking perhaps of some of the smaller areas where there are stations serving small communities.

MR. MURDOCH: Which one would you have in mind?

MR. COYNE: I haven't any in mind. I am making a hypothetical suggestion.

MR. MURDOCH: I suggest to you there are not any for private radio stations in Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: There may be communities that are barren in musical talent.

MR. COYNE: I have given some thought on the matter, and I seem to recall out in the West, a French-language station gave evidence that they were not operating at a profit. In fact, they had considerable ---

MR. MURDOCH: Is that the one in St. Boniface?

MR. COYNE: There are six French-language

stations, and they are all in the same position. In fact, St. Boniface station is the best.

MR. MURDOCH: There are exceptions.

MR. COYNE: How would you deal with those exceptions?

MR. MURDOCH: They should be dealt with, I would say, by the governors of the CBC.

MR. COYNE: Now, then, in what way? If you make a specific requirement ---

MR. MURDOCH: We can scale it -- I would not stick to the five per cent. Some should possibly spend seven, and others three, they should plough something into their industry.

MR. COYNE: But presumably the justification for grading might well be that it would not be in your interest to force any station out of business.

MR. MURDOCH: Oh, no, no. We believe in private enterprise in most things.

MR. COYNE: Now then, you go on in the last paragraph on page 9:

"In addition, the greatest possible encouragement should be given by the CBC to private stations to originate live Canadian programmes of their own for feeding to the networks. The private stations should in much greater measure become participating stations of the CBC network facilities, not merely outlets for CBC programmes." You refer to a development of that kind, to the

development say of separate private networks apart from the CBC?

MR. MURDOCH: No. As a matter of fact our suggestion has been done by the CBC. Out of London, Ontario, there was -- on the network programmes -- radio programmes originating from -- I am sure on television we have had originations in Edmonton, Calgary, you know, minor things. Regina, even in Regina, Saskatoon, all the way along. There is not any reason why, as I said before, if they have talent they should not have to pull up stakes and move anywhere, but they should be able to live in their own town because you never develop talent -- in the Province of Alberta three or four years ago there were more violin students than any other province of Canada. A violin can be carried around easily. In some of the orchestras there was no woodwind part, no such thing as a flute, oboe or clarinet, and that sort of thing. The local people took lessons on the trumpet or trombone or saxophone and drums and so on, but many of the requests we have got have come from the West for the finest musical quartette. I resent the West being regarded as a hilly-billy, as a rock and roll, as a jive country. They all have their place. If you like it you have it.

THE CHAIRMAN: From your knowledge of the availability of musical talent of a sufficiently high standard for the purpose, would you say that the CBC has done as much as it should have done

toward originating live musical programmes for feeding to the network from outside, or are they missing ---

MR. MURDOCH: I agree with that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then you think they have done as much as they might do?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes, I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just wanted to know if your charge was they have failed to take advantage of what exists.

MR. MURDOCH: No, just trying to encourage them to expand in what they have been doing.

MR. COYNE: Turning to the top of page 10, Mr. Murdoch, you say your Federation must express concern over the policy of the CBC which provides without any charge whatsoever thousands of hours of programme material in both radio and television to the private stations on a network and non-network basis. Now, it has been suggested to us that the way broadcasting in this country is organized for the present, is that the CBC is charged with providing a national broadcasting service, but that it does not have sufficient stations of its own to reach all the areas of this country, so that it utilizes facilities of private stations through network arrangements in areas where it does not have its own stations, and it does not charge the station for the network programme, and the station does not charge the CBC for the time.

Now, is that a situation that you object to?

MR. MURDOCH: You have not stated it quite correctly. The private stations do get -- a Joe from Newfoundland said they get thirty per cent of their charge --

THE CHAIRMAN: On the commercial programmes?

MR. MURDOCH: Two hundred dollars. So that they got \$60 for presenting a programme that they could not possibly originate. Now, we have television stations, there is one in Calgary -- that is privately owned. They have a monopoly, and the musicians there have been treated very badly, They have all refused to negotiate, only on their terms, and speak of their great responsibility to the public -- because they have a monopoly. There is one down in Peterborough, and they recently had a strike there, the conditions in that station -- which was owned by a newspaper, radio and television thing -- other unions have had difficulty with it.

MR. COYNE: You mentioned a little earlier, I think, and you can correct me if I am wrong, in television you do not allow the CBC network productions to go out over private stations?

MR. MURDOCH: I did not say that.

MR. COYNE: You correct me, then.

MR. MURDOCH: I said without our consent. Somebody in the CBC got the idea that salvation was free and handed our product to these people who won't give our people any employment.

MR. COYNE: Would you say they handed your product to the local station or rather that

they were handing this programme to the people in the area in which the local station serves?

MR. MURDOCH: That is a very delightful way to put it.

MR. COYNE: Are you suggesting that the people of Calgary, where there doesn't happen to be a CBC station, should be denied the right to hear national programmes which are produced for the people of Canada?

MR. MURDOCH: No, certainly not. I am suggesting that the Calgary station has not any right to accept, to be fed the product of the American Federation of Musicians, Canadian artists, when they refused to negotiate any kind of agreement for the local people, and if the Calgary people did not get the programmes, they would suddenly waken up and say, "What is the matter with this private station monopoly?"

MR. COYNE: Is not the CBC prepared to pay your musicians whatever the agreed rates of pay are for producing this network programme and distributing it through various areas of Canada?

MR. MURDOCH: That is not in the agreement. The agreement does not say that at all.

MR. COYNE: In other words, you would not agree in the agreement?

MR. MURDOCH: It is a matter of negotiation.

MR. COYNE: As a matter of negotiation in the agreement you did not agree?

MR. MURDOCH: That is right.

MR. COYNE: That CBC programmes ---

MR. MURDOCH: It was not requested.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your people are paid for their time, aren't they?

MR. MURDOCH: We are not -- we are paid for so many publications. If you put an ad in the newspaper you just don't pay for four papers. It is sent across Canada. Every time it appears you pay for it, you have to pay for it.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But in the motion picture business, the author does not get paid every time a picture is shown. I do not see much difference.

MR. MURDOCH: May I put in as an exhibit our agreement?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, let us have it.

MR. MURDOCH: So that our legal friends can read it. My Scotch grandfather would turn over in his grave over that.

THE CHAIRMAN: That will be Exhibit 110-D.

EXHIBIT NO. 110-D: Agreement referred to.

MR. COYNE: Would it be fair to say this, Mr. Murdoch, as a result of this agreement which you had which does not permit the Calgary station to carry this programme, as a result of that the people in the Calgary area, the Canadians in the Calgary area are not able to see CBC produced programmes with live Canadian musicians?

MR. MURDOCH: On the contrary, they are seeing it at this moment. That is what I object to.

MR. COYNE: With your consent?

MR. MURDOCH: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think what Mr. Murdoch is saying, they are in fact putting out the programme through the stations such as Calgary and Peterborough, but this was not contemplated in the agreement when it was made. Is that correct?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Is the CBC in breach of their agreement?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now on this point, Mr. Murdoch -- well, you go on, Mr. Coyne.

MR. COYNE: I would like to follow with one more question, Mr. Chairman, and that is this: As a matter of practice do you think it is fair that for the purpose of bringing pressure on a radio or television station operator, you should deny the public, who depend upon him for broadcasting service, that opportunity of hearing programmes?

MR. MURDOCH: No, not if we are paid, and I don't represent the general public. They elect people to represent them. My concern is a selfish one. I represent professional musicians. I have an axe to grind.

MR. COYNE: In other words, you would not attempt to justify your stand as being say in the public interest?

MR. MURDOCH: Oh, yes, it would be in the public interest.

MR. COYNE: How?

MR. MURDOCH: If the people of Calgary, if the musicians and actors and artists in Calgary were properly paid, it would be in the public interest.

MR. COYNE: There was an incident that was brought to our attention in Vancouver, and perhaps you might comment on it because I think you might know the facts. The station in Penticton, which is a private station, was used to carry the Metropolitan Opera broadcasts on Saturday afternoon, connecting in Penticton at twelve noon. That apparently is an unfavourable hour for the people in the Okanagan to listen to opera, and they applied for the privilege of delaying that broadcast until three in the afternoon.

MR. MURDOCH: To whom did he apply?

MR. COYNE: He applied, I believe, to the CBC. At the same time he applied, some comparable station operating across the border in Idaho applied for delay privileges and it was granted. Now, the man in the Okanagan was not, and the result was that the Metropolitan Opera broadcast was taken off the air and the people in the Okanagan Valley didn't hear it. It was suggested, as I recollect the proceedings in Vancouver, that this was the result of some ruling or decision taken by the Musicians Union.

MR. MURDOCH: We have never heard of it

at all. It is entirely an internal matter for the CBC.

MR. COYNE: Do you have any regulations or rules relating to the right of a private station to delay a broadcast?

MR. MURDOCH: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is your consent not required?

MR. MURDOCH: A private station?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, for the CBC to be permitted to delay a broadcast?

MR. MURDOCH: It is covered in the contract. It is all spelled out there.

MR. COYNE: I have not read the contract.

THE CHAIRMAN: You presumably have.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: It was definitely stated in Vancouver that because of the contract with the Musicians Union they would not permit a delayed broadcast.

MR. MURDOCH: I don't know anything about it, Mr. Commissioner.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was suggested to us that the reason why there was the refusal to consent to this delayed broadcast was the fact you had not been able to work out a labour agreement with the private stations.

MR. MURDOCH: I would have heard of that.

MR. COYNE: Can you tell us briefly what the provisions in the contract are respecting applications to delay network broadcasts?

MR. MURDOCH: It is in the contract. I

mean, an Eastern programme originating under Dominion network may be delayed -- I am not sure -- and comes on three hours later, and the same thing is west to east, and that has been operating for the last six years.

MR. COYNE: Is any distinction made in this right of delay between CBC operated stations and private operated stations?

MR. MURDOCH: No, because they haven't any delays, they have the network, there are no delays.

MR. COYNE: Private stations, many of them, are affiliated with either the Dominion or Trans-Canada network?

MR. MURDOCH: I do not know of a case. I do not know of the case. We have facilitated very often what has been a class of programme with the CBC. They say may we delay this and put something on, and we say yes.

MR. COYNE: This is all covered by the contract?

MR. MURDOCH: That is right -- quite a document.

MR. COYNE: Turning to your next point, Mr. Murdoch, where you speak about protection against foreign imported material, and you suggest that this matter be carefully studied, I gather you are not making any specific recommendation, but merely that the matter be studied?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes.

MR. COYNE: This question, including the

question of whether or not there should be some sort of tariff arrangement, has been before us before, and one of the points that came up -- I think it was in connection with the Canadian Labour Congress, arose in this way: they had a suggestion that the matter of protection be considered, and they also had another suggestion, that the CBC should make some effort to develop an export market for Canadian programmes.

Now, the two might be mutually inconsistent, and I was wondering if you had given any thought to the possibility that if Canada put tariffs on these programmes that foreign countries would perhaps naturally be tempted to put tariffs on, too?

MR. MURDOCH: That is true. The tariff is now just on the physical platter, and in some of the United States stations they will play a recording with forty men in the orchestra recording, and as few as four or five will play a dramatic show. We want to avoid that.

MR. COYNE: Do you support the proposition that it would be worth while to develop, if only for revenue purposes, to export Canadian programmes to other countries?

MR. MURDOCH: They have been exported, of course, to Australia before now, and to the States.

MR. COYNE: Would you agree that it is a worthwhile thing to seek to develop?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Am I right, Mr. Murdoch, in thinking your primary interest, which you frankly stated was a selfish one, is to expand the market for the talents of Canadian musicians?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would be a fair way to summarize it?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: This country has sixteen million people, compared to the country beside us of 160 million people, and many more large and completely developed broadcasting systems than anyone in the world. Other products that this country produces, we have got over the relative smallness of our market by process of export, by expanding our market, by taking in an export market, and we are faced undeniably with a very serious financial problem for radio and television, which, despite your primary interest, you as a Canadian have to be concerned with.

Now, it has been said to us that one of the things that inhibit export, similarly one of the things that is inhibiting the programme of really trying large programmes where you may spend \$35,000 for a programme -- but that is a lot to spend for say half an hour -- but there is an inhibition to that kind of programme, that kind of employment for musicians by the provisions for the very high charges for repeat performances.

In other words, the suggestion has been made that you might get a lot more employment if the costs

of these very good expensive programmes which are worth repeating could be repeated at not too great a financial penalty, and similarly, if you could export these good programmes to other countries at no great financial penalty. This has been suggested to us, and I would like to have your comment.

MR. MURDOCH: That would be an excellent thing for negotiation, Mr. Chairman. At the present time there is no additional charge on Canadian television going to the United States; I think that is kinescope. You will find that in the agreement.

MR. COYNE: Regardless of the number of reproductions, showings of the film?

MR. MURDOCH: Well, you are not suggesting that the thing be syndicated all over every station in the United States?

MR. COYNE: I am not suggesting anything. I was just asking the question for clarification.

MR. MURDOCH: It would be a repeat. It would be an original programme complete one time.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: On one station?

THE CHAIRMAN: And there is no charge for that work?

MR. MURDOCH: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I was told at the time I was asking this question, it was a dramatic programme which does not fall within your jurisdiction, but this was a programme of Macbeth, and I think I was told that the reason it had not been exported was, while the Americans were violently

anxious to get new good programmes, was the extraordinarily high extra cost that would be involved in the extra payments for the artists involved in that programme.

MR. MURDOCH: I think the actors might have a very legitimate right to ask that the outstanding actors -- and I don't know their business any more than the average layman does -- but I know the stars get infrequent -- they could not put on too frequently, and they have months without employment -- for one of these larger roles, and if it is anything to be exported to another market, I think they should have some compensation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Even though they are well paid for the time they are on the job?

MR. MURDOCH: That is relative, the "well paid," Mr. Chairman. I don't know.

MR. COYNE: I interrupted you when you were dealing with the United States, and you said under the present arrangement there is no additional charge for the export of a kinescope of a Canadian television programme for a single network performance in the United States?

MR. MURDOCH: But you have soloists who are not members of our organizations, and actors and that sort of thing.

MR. COYNE: Who would be covered by different contracts than yours?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes.

MR. COYNE: What about other countries than

the United States? Does the same apply for export, say, to Australia or Britain or France?

MR. MURDOCH: No, it is fifty per cent over the basic scale to any other country but the United States.

MR. COYNE: Is that again for a single performance?

MR. MURDOCH: That is right. If they wanted to syndicate, we want to negotiate.

MR. COYNE: As it stands for the moment, for example, if someone wanted to make a kinescope of a musical programme they would then pay your standard rate of pay for the showing of that show on the Canadian network, and if they wanted to take a kine and send it to Australia they would have to pay fifty per cent?

MR. MURDOCH: That is right, of the original cost.

MR. COYNE: I think that is perhaps the situation we discussed before.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it was actually the Canadian Labour Congress. This means if the Toronto Symphony Orchestra is put on TV and taken down on kinescope, your musicians get paid so much, and that can be sent out either by microwave or by kinescope for a performance through the Canadian system and can be -- without further payment -- and can be exported once to the United States by kinescope for network transmission?

MR. MURDOCH: That is right, yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: But if the Montreal Symphony wants to send to Paris, France, they have to pay fifty per cent extra for musicians?

MR. MURDOCH: That is right. As a matter of fact, there is not any reason why we exempted the United States. We just forgot to put them in the agreement.

THE CHAIRMAN: I cannot believe such negligence as this.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: How about repeat performances in Canada?

MR. MURDOCH: There is no fee for that.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Exactly the same programme twice or even a third time?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes, if the public will take it three times.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is one of the points we are talking about, in terms of quality of programmes, and there are some programmes which are very expensive to produce which probably people would want to hear a number of times, the same way as a theatrical or musical production is many times listened to by the same people, and I had it in mind that the CBC, for example, or a private station -- let us take the CBC -- could not spend a large sum of money and then spread that over several performances without extra payment to the musician. You say that is not so?

MR. MURDOCH: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Is there any distinction in that

regard, Mr. Murdoch, between sponsored and sustaining programmes ?

MR. MURDOCH: A commercial programme is quite different. It is revenue producing.

THE CHAIRMAN: That may be what I am thinking of.

MR. COYNE: Can you describe briefly what the conditions are respecting the conditions of a repeat programme?

MR. MURDOCH: You are speaking now of Canada? The CBC do delay on television because of the time element.

MR. COYNE: Oh, yes.

MR. MURDOCH: Without any extra cost.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is in the agreement?

MR. MURDOCH: Whether it be commercial or sustaining.

THE CHAIRMAN: On Mr. Coyne's question, supposing there was a sponsored programme by the XY company, or let us say of the Toronto Symphony Orchestra, one of the provisions if the CBC wished to sell that again as a musical programme to that or some other sponsor for repeat from the recording, is there a provision for that?

MR. MURDOCH: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: You cannot do that?

MR. MURDOCH: No.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You could by paying in full again or only a percentage of the original charges?

MR. MURDOCH: It has not arisen, Mr. Commissioner. We have not had that before.

THE CHAIRMAN: It may well be that it is not a practical question, but I think you are right, Mr. Coyne, it was on the commercial side this came up, but on the non-commercial, the matters for which the CBC pays two musicians or orchestras as a sustaining programme, you say once they have paid your musicians for that sustaining programme, they may repeat that?

MR. MURDOCH; Under the conditions of the contract, it is free.

MR. COYNE: Would it be possible to turn up the section of the contract -- have you only one copy of the contract, Mr. McMaster?

-

(Page 2643 follows)

-

-

MR. MURDOCH: I have only the one copy here.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Murdoch, would you think in the interests of perhaps developing this export market that we have been speaking of, the matter of the rates to be paid in circumstances of that kind might properly be a matter for negotiation?

MR. MURDOCH: This would be a matter for negotiation between the CBC and ourselves.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to make it clear that was really all that was in my mind. Obviously it is too complex a step for us to get into, but I wanted to find out from you, from your viewpoint it was open for negotiation?

MR. MURDOCH: Oh, yes, always.

THE CHAIRMAN: Frankly, I personally, and I think most of the Commission, have just as great an interest as you have in seeing an expansion of Canadian musicians' employment, and this may be worth looking into.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Murdoch, you go on to suggest that the matter of broadcast regulations in the CBC should be divorced from the station relations branch where it is presently combined in the one branch?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes.

MR. COYNE: You do not go so far as to support what has been described as an independent regulatory board?

MR. MURDOCH: No.

MR. COYNE: Overseeing both the private

broadcasting and the CBC?

MR. MURDOCH: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the reason why you think these two functions now combined in stations relations and enforcement should be separated?

MR. MURDOCH: It is just that a stations relation man has to be an ambassador of goodwill, he has to be a liaison between the CBC and the stations, and it is pretty difficult for him to turn around the next time and say, "You are breaking the regulations". I think the government board should be affected by and report to the Governors of the CBC on their activities.

MR. COYNE: You then go on to comment on the wretched CBC facilities in Toronto, and ---

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Before you go beyond the point of enforcement, you say on page 11:

"It is our impression that
flagrant offences against the broad-
casting regulations are being per-
mitted . . ."

It is an impression, true, but have you any specific instances?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes, one this morning, Mr. Commissioner. A local radio station this morning -- you see, we do not think it is our function to be a policeman, we think a regulation of this kind should be observed, and so if you do not mind I will not mention the name of the station, but we had it monitored this morning, and in thirty minutes

there were thirteen spots of advertising between the hours of 8.15 and 8.45.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not want you to tell us who it is, but that was a private radio station in Toronto?

MR. MURDOCH: It was, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that is one example; after all, you are not monitoring all the time, but is this something that periodically you do when you find this kind of thing?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And is it mainly the breach of the regulation having to do with advertising content that you refer to, or are there any other regulations that you are concerned about?

MR. MURDOCH: Well, for instance, frequently, as most people do, I tune in the radio in my car, and I have driven along and if I was sitting at a desk with a pencil in my hand I could not keep up with the telephone numbers they give, you could not possibly get it all down. I imagine the station had to make so many announcements in a day, but it is futile, and in so far as the regulations are concerned, it was amusing.

THE CHAIRMAN: But it is mainly the content, the advertising content?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes, and the number that are permitted in the classified material.

THE CHAIRMAN: What do you mean by classified material?

MR. MURDOCH: For instance, you will get this, Mr. Chairman, where an orchestra leader who is on a record will have taped a conversation with a disc jockey whom he never saw in his life and never will see, and he will say, "How are you, Joe?" "I am fine, thank you, Bill; which one of your records shall I play today?" and he will put the record on. I do not think many of the public are fooled, but it just is not honest. They do not say it is a recorded programme, or transcribed.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Murdoch, when you were speaking a moment ago about the repeat of recorded programmes and you said that they could be repeated in Canada without additional charge, were you speaking there of radio or television?

MR. MURDOCH: Radio.

MR. COYNE: Now, what about television?

MR. MURDOCH: There is a repeat on television.

MR. COYNE: Well, I have before me the agreement --- ?

MR. MURDOCH: There is thirty days.

MR. COYNE: It says in Section 3B, 2 and 3, having to do with kinescope that such kinescopes may be broadcast only on television stations which at the time of the live broadcast are owned or affiliated with the CBC, and that such kinescopes can only be broadcast one time by owned and operated stations of the CBC within thirty days of the broadcast of the television show?

MR. MURDOCH: That is right.

MR. COYNE: From what you stated with regard to radio, is not the same situation in regard to television much more restricted?

MR. MURDOCH: That is right.

MR. COYNE: So, in effect, where a kinescope is made of a programme involving your personnel it might only be shown once for the purpose of enabling the network to be operated before the microwave system has been fully developed?

MR. MURDOCH: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: This once is not a repeat once?

MR. COYNE: No, no.

MR. MURDOCH: No.

MR. COYNE: So there is no provision whatsoever in your present contract permitting more than a single showing over the CBC network?

MR. MURDOCH: That is correct, on television.

MR. COYNE: Is it true also that when you were speaking about export regulations that you were dealing with radio, too?

MR. MURDOCH: Repeat that question, please.

MR. COYNE: When you were describing the arrangements with respect to the export of programmes were you also speaking of radio and television?

MR. MURDOCH: Radio and television. We would be very glad to sit down and negotiate with the CBC and find out what is in their mind, or any other station.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the question is, you did tell us that at the present time the export of a programme for one network showing could be done to the United States, you said because you had forgotten to include the United States in your contract?

MR. MURDOCH: That was quite right, that is in radio.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is only radio?

MR. MURDOCH: Only radio.

THE CHAIRMAN: And not television?

MR. MURDOCH: That is right.

MR. COYNE: So in television it is not possible to export a programme or kine to the United States at all under your present contract?

MR. MURDOCH: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Or to any other part of the world?

MR. MURDOCH: We have given permission, of course, for a programme to go to Britain, and I think we are not difficult to get on with, but we like to negotiate these things.

MR. COYNE: In those specific cases did the fifty per cent additional rate of pay apply as a condition of your consent?

MR. MURDOCH: No, it was a straight charitable act which we do not want to boast about.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand you did say that in answer to me, the willingness to sort of examine this whole problem applied to both radio and television?

MR. MURDOCH: That is right.

MR. COYNE: When records are played over the radio are the performers not entitled to receive a royalty or some compensation?

MR. MURDOCH: None at all.

MR. COYNE: None at all?

MR. MURDOCH: None at all.

MR. COYNE: Only the copyright owner gets a consideration?

MR. MURDOCH: The copyright is in the disc.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is in the recording?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes.

MR. COYNE: So, as far as an artist is concerned, when a record which he or she made is played over the air, there is no compensation received by the artist?

MR. MURDOCH: That is right, unless he has a royalty agreement of his own, which, my information has been lately, there has been very little of, outside of great name dance bands who make their own deal generally, and they are very happy to have a million copies sold.

THE CHAIRMAN: What that really comes to is, the musician is in the record business, having paid for his time and the record belongs to the person who made it?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes, but, Mr. Chairman, he made that record for domestic use, for homes and that sort of thing; he did not make it for some "joe" to sell to somebody else to make a commercial record and put it on the air.

THE CHAIRMAN: He must in the past few years have recognized this might happen?

MR. MURDOCH: That sort of thing is insidious, it creeps up on you, and we are trying to crush it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, this has been going on for a little while, this putting records on the air?

MR. MURDOCH: Oh, yes.

MR. COYNE: Turning to the section of your brief on wretched CBC facilities in Toronto, you made this statement:

"In an effort to save the taxpayers' money in capital equipment it would seem that the taxpayers' money is being wasted on inefficient operations."

Is this sort of a situation of being penny wise and pound foolish?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes, I would say it is.

MR. COYNE: Your point is, if larger sums had been invested in proper capital equipment the operating expense would have been reduced?

MR. MURDOCH: That is right.

MR. COYNE: And in your summary on the following page, page 14, your first point is:

"That the CBC, and the broadcasting industry generally do their utmost to encourage and develop Canadian musicians."

I would like to ask you this, is the encouragement

and development of Canadian musicians wholly a matter of hiring talent or are there other ways in which the broadcasting industry can encourage and develop Canadian musicians? I will tell you what I have in mind. In Edmonton we had a rather interesting presentation from one of the local radio stations, which described what it had done in the way of actively promoting the Edmonton Symphony Orchestra, and it appeared that the survival of that orchestra was the result, to some extent at any event, of the very active promotion which this radio station had given to their cause; would you admit that as being a field in which the broadcasting industry can ---

MR. MURDOCH: Yes, I would applaud it.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I think the curious thing about that was the Symphony orchestra did not want their concerts broadcast.

MR. COYNE: That is true.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: The radio station advertised it so that you could get as many season ticket holders going to the symphony as possible, but the symphony in that case did not want to broadcast, although the private station would have done it.

MR. MURDOCH: Well, I do not know the details, but I think there was an Ethiopian in the woodpile -- what was the name of the station?

MR. COYNE: CJCA, as a matter of fact, Mr. Murdoch; it is one of the stations you specifically mention on page 7 of your brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: CJCA in Edmonton. Actually,

I think it was explained to us that it was based on the attitude of the orchestra people who felt that if the concert were broadcast they would have difficulty in getting people to attend in the hall, which is not exactly a nigger in the woodpile, but it is an explanation. It is the same as certain sports promoters who do not want hockey or football broadcast because it might cut down the live attendance. The fact is, as Mr. Coyne points out, this is one action by, in this case, a private station to assist in the development of music, and we had a similar thing in Vancouver where it was the CBC that had done much to develop the symphony orchestra.

MR. COYNE: And in making the recommendation, Mr. Murdoch, you have in mind encouragement and development of that kind, or are you thinking purely in terms of the actual hiring of musical talent?

MR. MURDOCH: No, I think that the private stations and the CBC have some responsibility to help develop entertainment talent. I am referring to subsection (f) of the regulations of the CBC, which says it is necessary to promote and ensure the greater use of Canadian talent by Corporation and private stations. That is the regulations of the CBC and the National network including private stations.

MR. COYNE: I think that is Section 21(f) of the Canadian Broadcasting Act?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the Broadcasting Act,

not the regulations

MR. MURDOCH: That is right.

MR. COYNE: I have no further questions.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: On page 12 of your submission, you feel that the private broadcasting stations should be forced to submit their statements and publish them?

MR. MURDOCH: I do, sir.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Why should they be put in any different position to, say, the Musicians Union?

MR. MURDOCH: As a matter of fact, Mr. Commissioner, the complete record of the American Federation of Musicians is up in the College Street reference library, and every library in Canada and the United States.

THE CHAIRMAN: Currently?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes, and if you are here tomorrow I will be very glad to give you a copy and make it an exhibit.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well then, earlier in your submission you made a statement which rather left me with the impression you felt the private stations, by carrying a certain amount of CBC programmes without being charged by the CBC, was actually being subsidized?

MR. MURDOCH: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, we have the submission from both the private broadcasters and the CBC that they feel it is a mutually satisfactory arrangement and that nobody is being

subsidized because, by reason of the obligations placed on the CBC to carry a national network, they would have been required to put in stations themselves in those places which they do not now cover, and by the cooperation between the two peoples, private and public, the private stations are actually giving a service to CBC in carrying these sustaining programmes, and both parties feel that by carrying programmes without cost, but by giving the time, they are assisting the CBC and the CBC feels that the arrangement made is entirely satisfactory and that there is no semblance of subsidization in that arrangement.

MR. MURDOCH: Well, Mr. Commissioner, I would not dare criticize the negotiations of the CBC and the private broadcasters, I am only concerned with by this method the people on the radio are not getting employment. We were not consulted on a deal of that sort.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But you would not get any further employment if it were changed because then the CBC, by reason of their obligation under the Act, would have to put in stations in those places where they are not now being heard, and that programme would be heard but over a CBC station, so there would not be any further employment?

MR. MURDOCH: That is a correct statement.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well then, the only thing, the only other thing I would like to look into is to get your opinion on -- we have heard

of two or three different occasions going across the country that musical programmes lend themselves much more to radio than to television because the cranking of the cameras and one thing and another disturbs the musicians. Would you comment on that?

MR. MURDOCH: No, that is not true.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: That is not true?

MR. MURDOCH: No.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the last point was, it was not only the distraction to the musicians but there was some distraction for the viewer in television where the camera was attempting to keep moving about the orchestra and the radio was the more appropriate medium for pure musical programmes, and television more for the things where visual presentation was desired. Have you any comments on this?

MR. MURDOCH: Well, I think that musicians generally, when they are playing, their musical life is very short and generally they are very good looking and well groomed and I think it would add to the enjoyment to see them, and we would realize there was still some live musicians left.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I have asked all my questions. I would like to thank you very much for coming, and we will consider your brief. We will adjourn now for five minutes.

---A short recess.

SUBMISSION OF MAPLE LEAF GARDENS LIMITED

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we are to hear is the Maple Leaf Gardens Limited; Mr. Bolton and Mr. Evans. We have your brief, and we will mark it as Exhibit 111.

EXHIBIT NO. 111: Brief by Maple Leave Gardens Limited.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, we have submitted a written brief and instead of reading it I would like to bring up two points arising out of the brief, that we feel that our national game of hockey should share in and be recognized in the cultural activities of CBC. We offered this opportunity to CBC by requesting they televise the games which have a very great appeal provincialwide, especially in our Eastern Canada finals recently completed between the Quebec representatives and the Ontario representatives, and also in the national final in the Memorial Cup between Western and Eastern teams.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those are the points?

MR. EVANS: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: There are only a few questions. On page 2 of the brief you say that the Imperial Oil has carried the full load financially in sponsoring NHL hockey, both on radio and TV. Is this one hundred per cent true?

MR. EVANS: As I understand it.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Or is there not a

portion of this broadcast which is carried by CBC funds?

MR. EVANS: That is our understanding.

MR. BOLTON: I couldn't advise you on that. The CBC probably would be the only people who could give you that information.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You have made the statement, and I was wondering whether my information was correct.

MR. BOLTON: That is our knowledge.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any figures at all, Mr. Evans, as to how much the telecasting of a Junior Hockey game costs?

MR. EVANS: No, I haven't.

MR. BOLTON: That would be CBC information.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Have you ever tried to sell the Junior Hockey to sponsors?

MR. BOLTON: Yes, two years ago, and last year they didn't take it and we tried not so much to sell it as to get them interested in it, and it was turned down without any mention of price or money at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you are coming here with a recommendation calling for the expenditure, as it now stands, of public funds?

MR. BOLTON: Not necessarily. It could be sponsored. It has been.

MR. EVANS: It was two years ago.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would suspect that if anybody wanted to sponsor these and pay the cost,

probably it would be carried.

MR. BOLTON: You are only suspecting there, Mr. Chairman, too.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why wouldn't it be carried?

MR. BOLTON: I don't know why it wouldn't be carried. We tried to get them interested to take it and we got no where with it.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Would that be due to the fact they had another sponsored programme at that time?

MR. BOLTON: It could be, on the times that we were playing the games. That could be the answer, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I wonder if it could be this; in the responsibility to produce a balanced television programme, they might think the present quantity of hockey represented by the NHL games, which are very widely listened to, was about all the hockey that a balanced programme could stand. Could that be the reason?

MR. BOLTON: If you are going to balance hockey, then everything else should be balanced too.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is what they are supposed to do.

MR. BOLTON: Where films fill in so much of the time it is hard to think that is going to be a reasonable answer.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Would you be satisfied with a film to be put on as a delayed broadcast, or would you want it live?

MR. BOLTON: We would like it live.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Because if it is live I can see where there may be a conflict in the timing because of obligations they have to some other sponsor

MR. BOLTON: We would certainly like it live because a thing of that kind is topical and loses a lot of its value on a delayed basis.

THE CHAIRMAN: But it is probably fair to say that the responsibility for determining what is a proper programme balance must rest with the CBC?

MR. BOLTON: That I agree with.

MR. EVANS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it is a specific and special point. I am reminded by Mr. Stewart that on your reference to the fact that hockey is to be considered as part of cultural life in Canada you have very powerful support in the brief presented to us by a group from the University of British Columbia in Vancouver.

MR. BOLTON: Thank you very much.

MR. EVANS: Thank you.

(Page 2660 follows)

SUBMISSION OF THE CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF
HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND
RECREATION, INCORPORATED

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is that of the Canadian Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation. We will begin by marking your brief as Exhibit 112.

EXHIBIT NO. 112: Brief of Canadian Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Incorporated.

MR. DEVENEY: I have an opening statement, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to read to you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well.

MR. DEVENEY: "In submitting this brief on behalf of the Canadian Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Incorporated, we are conscious of our limitations in respect to the technical aspects of television and radio. We consider ourselves professional people in the areas of educational interest enumerated in our title because we meet the qualifications of a profession. We have a body of knowledge upon which we base our beliefs; we have a background of literature and research which is recognized as authentic in many areas other than ours; and we have a period of professional training recognized within a university framework both in Canada and United States, for degree purposes.

"Therefore, from this professional standpoint of interest in the education of

school age children and in respect to the health attitudes and physical, social and recreational activities for this youth audience, we feel we can speak with some authority.

"It is not proposed to read our brief to you but we would like to emphasize the section in it wherein we make seven points as to what our Association, from our standpoint, expects from television and radio programmes. While we have purposely limited our thoughts to brief statements, we are prepared to expand on each of the statements contained in this section should questions be directed to us on them. Individual members of the committee will do this.

"The other section of our brief we would like to emphasize is that on recommendations. In making these recommendations we have not related them to possible financial adjustments they might require. We realize the importance of such requirements, of course, but feel we are not competent to deal adequately with them.

"Finally, Mr.Chairman, we would like to say, in a very general way, that what we have tried to say in our brief in no way is to be construed as a criticism of public or private approaches to these powerful educational media, television and broadcasting. We are a neutral body in respect to questions of overall

organizational policy. We are in agreement with the need for programme controls affecting the growth and development of children. At the present time, however, the indications to us are that television and radio need the control of a public corporation such as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

"We would like to thank you and members of your Commission for giving us the privilege of presenting this brief to you."

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir, and thank you all for coming. Mr. Coyne will take over the questioning, and you are perfectly at liberty to ask any of your associates to answer the questions.

MR. COYNE: Would you tell us, Mr. Deveney, something about the organization of the Canadian Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation; is it a national organization?

MR. DEVENEY: The Canadian Association, which we refer to as "CAHPER", using the letters of the full title, is the only incorporated professional body of teachers, administrators and others in the field of education, physical education and recreation in Canada. Our members are drawn from schools, from technical colleges, from administration posts, from the recreation field, from universities, and so forth. We were founded you may say in 1932 with the first development of the organization known at that time as the Quebec Association for Physical Education. Later on the

Ontario Physical Education Association came into being, and in 1950 we incorporated it as the Canadian Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation.

MR. COYNE: Do you have provincial or local councils within your organization?

MR. DEVENEY: We have branches in the various provinces, and membership of these branches forms the individual membership of our national organization.

MR. COYNE: Is there any other professional organization in this field, either incorporated or unincorporated -- I mean specifically related to this field? You may be members of the Teachers Federation or something of that kind?

MR. DEVENEY: There is no national; there are organizations in the provinces, as far as I know.

MR. COYNE: In the field of physical education?

MR. DEVENEY: Yes.

MR. BOX: They may be concerned primarily with teachers, such as O.E.A. , but there is no national body.

MR. COYNE: Are you quite separate from the Ontario Educational Association and similar organizations of broader scope than your own particular association?

MR. DEVENEY: Individually we are members.

MR. COYNE: In your capacity as teachers and members of the teaching profession?

MR. DEVENEY: Yes.

MR. COYNE: At the bottom of the first page of your brief where you are speaking of what you expect from TV and radio programmes, you say:

"They should fulfil sound educational programmes designed to produce healthy attitudes. Methods of production should be consistent with the best educational methods."

Are you dealing there in terms of programmes specifically directed for educational purposes to children and youths, or are you speaking television programmes and radio programmes generally?

MR. WRIGHT: I think in that case we are referring to programmes that may have an impact upon the children between five and eighteen in the field of development in physical and health education, and that entails physical and mental health. We are very much concerned with the effect as far as some programmes may have on the mental health developments. I think at the present time we are rather pleased to see the growth that has taken place in the television programmes paralleling education. For instance, two years ago you had a programme called Junior Sports Club. In viewing those presentations many of the earmarks of good educational programmes did not exist, but that was followed by A Walk with Kirk, which was both entertaining and quite educational as far as youth was concerned, and involved many phases of education and sports. At the present time that has been

replaced by Junior Magazine, and we are quite pleased to see the trend that is paralleling the kind of things we look for in physical education. Do you want to ask questions as far as educational principles are concerned?

MR. COYNE: No, I was thinking more of clarifying the type of programme in which you are interested; that is, whether they are programmes which are specifically in the field of physical education and recreation, or whether you are concerned as well with more general programmes directed towards this five to eighteen group?

MR. WRIGHT: Our number one interest is the specific field of physical education, and we are also concerned in any of the other programmes that have an impact on sportsmanship, development of moral values, and that kind of thing. We are very much concerned, because it is our business, and if it has an impact -- I can't state one specifically at the present time -- but we are interested in more than just our own particular field.

MR. BOX: One thing we feel is that through the medium of athletics and sports you can direct a proper attitude of behaviour, or an improper attitude. For instance, we would abhor seeing the wrestling come down into the children's television hours -- the pro wrestling, I am talking about.

MR. COYNE: Going on to some of your recommendations, firstly you suggest that programme

time be set aside for children to view physical, social and recreational activities. Would you describe briefly what programmes you have in mind which would present these physical, social and recreational activities?

MR. BOX: Well, I have already indicated one we would not like to see. There is a programme which is presented out of Montreal, Vic Obec's programme which very often has very many fine things about it. He goes through the proper teaching methods and techniques. He has the right approach to it. However, there are certain programmes in which some of his material may be questioned. For instance, there was an instance of a proper method of breathing in swimming. We wondered whether there should not be someone checking that particular information. Through the medium of athletics and sports with the school age youngsters you can either by leadership and teaching produce a proper or an improper attitude. Every one who participates in sport and is interested is not going to be a good citizen, and that is the fundamental purpose of education -- to produce good citizenship.

MR. COYNE: Am I right in thinking that the Vic Obek show is not specifically directed to the five to eighteen year old group?

MR. BOX: It comes in that particular showing period.

MR. COYNE: Eight o'clock at night, is it?

MR. BOX: Seven-thirty.

MR. COYNE: And it is directed towards an adult audience, although no doubt younger people view it?

MR. BOX: That is right.

MR. SPEIRS: My son sees that I view it.

MR. COYNE: In your recommendation No. 5, you suggest that every effort be made to release special TV films for use in the classroom, for example, Boy on a Bike; have you ever attempted to buy such films?

MR. SPEIRS: We have attempted to "buy" them in the sense that we have suggested they be released free.

MR. COYNE: Who has these films?

MR. SPEIRS: The CBC, and we have been told they are not for sale or for release. Some of our people who have been working with CBC in the summer have been a little bit appalled at the way in which six or seven copies are made of everything that is released and then all but one file copy is destroyed, and it seemed to us that here was excellent teaching material that was being wasted, and it should either be released on a no-charge basis or on a basis that would enable the schools with low budgets to purchase them.

MR. COYNE: Are these films or kinescopes of programmes that have been made and gone over the television network?

MR. DEVENEY: Yes, I think so.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Would they be

programmes that had been sponsored?

MR. SPEIRS: No, not sponsored, but in which we have participated in the production.

MR. BOX: Apparently the block is that they pay photographers to do a certain piece of work and if they re-show them again the argument for the photographer is that they are doing the photographers out of a job.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is this the labour contract problem again, Mr. Dunton?

MR. DUNTON: In connection with all sorts of things; musicians, if they are involved, writers if writing is involved, or possibly photographers. We, as a rule, buy only the broadcasting rights, and usually only the Canadian broadcasting rights. As a rule, most material, we have no right to use it beyond that, and therefore, of course, heavy extra expense would be involved for a non-broadcasting service which is not covered by our Act. There is also the practical problem that some material is taken by staff photographers which does not involve writers, actors and so on, and at times it becomes a matter of expense of handling and making copies, and we do try to help people with that material, but not very much can be done without a good deal of extra expense.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would it be fair to say CBC would have no objection in its own policy towards the additional use of any of these features that could find another use, but you are caught in

certain regulations and certain cost factors to do it?

MR. DUNTON: Yes.

MR. COYNE: And those cost factors are largely related to the limited arrangements that you have with the various performers or technicians, or what have you, who take part in producing the film?

MR. DUNTON: Largely, yes, but not entirely.

MR. DEVENNEY: There is a possibility, though, that negotiations may be made through CBC and the photographers to work out an arrangement whereby photographers would gain the same type of royalty in the situation as is enjoyed by musicians?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it is a matter of negotiation. I think you are correct.

MR. WRIGHT: There is one point, Mr. Chairman, on additional cost; you may do a little more planning ahead of time if they were to be used afterwards. Departments like our own may be interested in buying copies, because it will be very costly for us to go out and make the film Boy on a Bike. It is a very important safety film, but at the present time we cannot use it at all.

MR. COYNE: Do you know whether the educational authorities have made any attempt to carry this thing further beyond the first approach to the CBC?

MR. WRIGHT: Other than just a telephone call from the organization I belong to, to CBC, and finding out at the present time regulations do not

permit it. We would like to open up the question, though.

THE CHAIRMAN: When you say the organization you belong to, what is that?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, I belong to this Association, CAHPER., and I am also director of physical education in the province.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is what I wanted to get.

MR. COYNE: But your answer is that to date you have not attempted as yet to initiate a further development?

MR. WRIGHT: No further development, no.

MR. BOX: There is one other thing, for the record; since this is national, and this is Ontario Provincial, it may not sit well politically. The Ontario Federation of School Athletic Associations have the same interest as the Department of Education. I am secretary of the Ontario Federation of School Athletic Associations.

MR. COYNE: But there is no conflict of interest here between you in your different capacities?

MR. BOX: No.

MR. DEVENEY: These gentlemen and Miss Barker are all individual members of CAHPER., and we are here as individual members.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes, that is so, but I was going to clarify the remark by Mr. Wright as to how he would like to use the films.

MR. SPEIRS: Mention was made of the cost of distribution: I think that could be eliminated

by transferring the films directly to Provincial Libraries of Education, who are accustomed to handling this sort of thing, and so you could ignore that feature of the cost.

MR. COYNE: That is, you think the cost would be assumed by the Provincial Libraries of Physical Education?

MR. SPEIRS: Correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is obviously something on which we cannot reach any final conclusion. The most you are asking is that this should be examined to give the maximum use to these useful films?

MR. WRIGHT: Correct, and I think at no further cost to CBC.

-

-

-
(Page 2672 follows)

-

-

MR. COYNE: Then just on your point 6, where you say that sponsorship of certain types should not be accepted for children's programmes, I take it you are not against sponsorship as such in principle?

MR. DEVENEY: Specific programmes -- Mr. Wright I think would amplify on that.

MR. WRIGHT: That would be a case in point here that if I am right, the laws of this province particularly do not permit minors to traffic in liquor and tobacco; yet at the same time we do appreciate the specific information on the Vic Obec show that is sponsored by a tobacco concern, and in our teaching and development of children we are somewhat concerned as to how you really bring these two points together and justify them.

MR. COYNE: What about the programmes that are not designed for children as such but are watched by children? Do you mean to suggest that the sponsorship which is quite suitable for adult audience, to whom the programme is directed, that such sponsorship should not be used simply because the children might be watching the programme?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, we are speaking specifically of between the hours of five to eight-thirty. We must admit those are the most suitable hours for a programme. I think what is shown after that to adults, whether it be liquor or tobacco, that is their own business. Whether the implication does not run parallel to our own educational principles, the mere fact that the growth patterns

of children of this age have developed discernment between the use of this tobacco or alcohol, I think as an educationalist I should like to throw the thing out as a question as to how we can make these two principles jibe.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to throw back the question to you to add this point. We are probably getting into pretty tricky ground here. The way it reads is that you say that a programme for children should not accept sponsorship or companies whose products in the opinion of health education authorities -- first of all, how do you get the opinion of health education authorities? How do you get that opinion in? Is that not the equivalent to asking for the health education authorities, whoever they are, for a certain sort of right of censorship on the sponsors of children's programmes?

MR. DEVENEY: I think the thought, Mr. Chairman, is that these opinions of the health education authorities are common knowledge. There are certain medical opinions; certain dental opinions on health and the use of products for health, and that programmes for children which are sponsored by companies whose products, in the opinion of these health education authorities, are consistent with the growth of children, should be conducted at a specific time when the majority of children will be looking at it and listening to it. Now, I do not think we suggest at all that there is an aspect of censorship

coming into this picture. Obviously I think that is far afield, but we can go half way and put the programme at times when they would be viewed by the majority of children and sponsored by companies whose products mainly are consistent with the growth of children because obviously a programme is going to be sponsored for advertising value and items concerning the product of these companies will appear before the children who are viewing the programme, however good the programme might be.

THE CHAIRMAN: The sort of thing that is bothering me, so that you understand my question -- you mentioned the opinion of dental authorities. I have a dentist friend who has very definite opinions that no children up to the age of ten years should be allowed to have any soft drinks or chocolate bars. Well now, if you cut out all these sponsorships you may end up with very few sponsored children's programmes.

MR. DEVENEY: Possibly, and possibly it might mean then that the CBC or a national organization must give consideration to financing of programmes without sponsorship.

MR. COYNE: Well, when you discuss the period of five to eight-thirty, you are not suggesting that the programmes in that period are or should be designed exclusively for children?

MR. BOX: No, but consideration should be given to the fact that children will be looking at them and probably make up the largest percentage of the listening or viewing

audience.

MR. COYNE: As late as 8.30?

MR. BOX: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are going further than merely suggesting that this type of sponsorship should not sponsor the children's programme as such. For example, obviously a big manufacturer is not going to sponsor a programme that is directed to 8-year-olds. In point of fact I do not think you do, but your point is that they should be carried further?

MR. BOX: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Then your final point is, you recommend that the C.B.C. appoint an Advisory Committee to make recommendations on children's programmes. Do you have in mind there the sort of arrangement which I understand they now have in respect to religious programmes and school broadcasts? For example, there is a national Religious Advisory Council. I believe there is a School Broadcasting Council.

MR. DEVENEY: Yes, exactly.

MR. COYNE: Your proposal is a somewhat similar arrangement with respect to children's programmes?

MR. DEVENEY: We are not prepared to make any recommendation as to the composition of the committee, except there should be one.

MR. WRIGHT: On that point, at one time we used the medium of radio for physical education, but just as radio may be more acceptable for music, television is a more important medium for activities

such as sports and games and what-not. We feel that this medium will mean a great deal more to our programme than radio ever has. However, it is important that a committee or someone in the C.B.C. should take a very definite interest in this type of programme; that things of the home and school and community are gotten across in terms of sportsmanship, in terms of character development and educational values -- that these values would receive consideration as far as possible and would be geared to parallel the kind of things that the schools do constantly and are attempting to do, because it would be very easy to break down if the pro wrestling did appear and if some of it at least did appear at 4.30 -- it would be very easy to break down the good things we teach during the day.

To have these lads see gouging eyes and what-not just disrupts the whole policy. If parents want to see it, that is one thing, but to bring it into the area of the children, we feel that it does need some consideration of a committee that would definitely look into this in the interests of the children and youth.

MR. COYNE: It is more important now that television is here than it was with radio?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, much more.

MR. COYNE: Those are all my questions, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are grateful to you for coming here and we will consider your brief.

SUBMISSION OF GROUP OF STUDENTS OF
JARVIS COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE

APPEARANCE:

Miss Rosemary Frank.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is to be presented by a group of students from Jarvis Collegiate Institute. Miss Rosemary Frank, I understand, is here to present the brief.

I think that perhaps you should introduce the group to the Board.

MISS FRANK: Lillian Eritch, Miss Anitra Hansen, Mr. Jim Lindala and Mr. Tim Scott.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will start by marking your brief as Exhibit 113.

EXHIBIT NO. 113: Brief of Jarvis Collegiate Institute.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you wish to read this brief now?

MISS FRANK: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Or summarize it, as you see fit. It is quite short and perhaps you might read it.

MISS FRANK: Mr. Chairman, we wish to make it quite clear before we start, we are not a representative group of teen-agers. We do not presume to be the stereotyped pattern into which adults seem to place us. We are a group of rugged individualists and this is our own idea.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have never found a

representative group yet.

MISS FRANK: This is entirely our own idea.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are very glad to have you come and show the interest in the way you have. Please go ahead.

MISS FRANK:

We, as a group of students of Jarvis Collegiate Institute, Toronto, respectfully submit the following observations to the Royal Commission.

This brief does not attempt to express the views of the entire student body since it was impossible to carry out a survey on so large a scale. It does, however, represent the opinions of a group of senior students following a considerable number of meetings to discuss problems related to the control of television in Canada. One conclusion which was reached was that while we were in favour of a government-run C.B.C., we do not want, as at present, a monopolistic control of television. The main discussion was confined to three areas.

(I) THE FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF THE PROBLEM.

Though we have a limited knowledge of the field of finance, we do wish to make a general statement concerning the problem of whether to meet costs by government grants or by the selling of time to commercial interests. We deplore the overusage of commercials for the upkeep of television. Since commercials seem to be a necessity for purposes of finance, we suggest "indirect advertising". This is the announcement before and after a programme that a specific firm is the sponsor, rather than the extolling

to the public of a particular commodity.

We further deplore the fact that great numbers of citizens seem to be labouring under the delusion that commercially-sponsored stations can produce entertainment without cost to themselves, and only government-controlled stations cost them money (in the form of taxes). Our opinion is that the Canadian citizen has to pay in either case. The sponsors hope to increase sales by means of the frequent commercials which are intended to rouse the interest of the public in that certain commodity. If the profits gained from such advertisement do not justify the initial expenditure, the sponsors might consider withdrawing the programme and introducing a programme by which they hope to make more profit. Thus the public helps pay for the commercially-produced entertainment even if by a more indirect way than taxes.

The constant interruption caused by commercials, whose text is often incongruous to the programme presented, is something to which patrons of the legitimate theatre are not subjected, and in our opinion the television audience should not be subjected to these interruptions either.

(II) THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE PROBLEM

Everyone is aware of the tremendous influence upon the public of both radio and television in thought, action and moulding of opinions upon the general public. And we do not believe that the control of such influence should pass to commercial interests.

We are sure that the public would never conceivably approve of passing over to commercial bodies control of our schools and the curricula carried on therein. The public accepts the necessity of a board of experts in the field of education, aware of educational purposes and processes. They may also accept the need of an unbiased approach to the problems of schools without thought of profit. Why, therefore, should control of television, which seven days a week influences our way of life, thought and habits, be turned over to private interests whose main concerns are profit and gain? We are of the opinion that it should not.

We are also concerned in this connection with the possibility of the lowering of standards. We feel this would automatically follow if private interests took complete control because of the desire of the sponsors to have as their programmes ones that satisfy and appeal only to popular demand. This appeal to popular demand can prove dangerous, inasmuch as it can become a means by which the rights of the majority can override the rights of the minority. A variety of productions is necessary to meet all the needs of the public. However, we feel that the standard of such productions should be raised to a higher level, to assure the cultural and educational future of Canadian television.

(III) THE PROBLEM OF PROMOTING A CLOSER
FEELING OF NATIONAL UNITY IN CANADA

There is a well-known tendency among a

great many of Canadians to decry programmes produced in Canada because of their Canadian origin and to praise those produced in the United States because of their American origin. We consider this unfair and wrong.

The ascendancy and benefits of such programmes from the United States are not being questioned because of their non-Canadian origin. We think, however, that they can become harmful when Canadian talents and ideas are supplanted by those of the United States. By all means let us have programmes of merit from outside Canada, but let us concentrate our time and money on promoting the development of Canadian art and artists.

The development of Canadian culture, by means of more programmes designed to give a wider view of Canadian life to all and more especially to newcomers to Canada, is, we feel, of vital importance. Surely such a development can originate only from the people of Canada. It is inconceivable to us that people of other lands can bring about the desired growth. By such people, we do not mean those people who come from other countries with the desire to become Canadians and contribute to the growth of Canada, but rather opportunists who desire only to make a profit.

We as Canadians feel it is the duty of television to bring such influences and power as it commands to assist in the retaining of a Canadian identity. Most important of all is the growth of a

culture which is not an imitation, but one peculiar to our heritage and to the environment in which we live.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Miss Frank.

MISS FRANK: We should like to thank you, sir, for permitting us to present this brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are very glad to have you. I do not know whether you were here when I made this sort of statement before, but we wish to ask a few questions of those who present briefs, and these are not asked with any thought of indicating disagreement with the briefs but merely to bring out the various points, so do not misunderstand the fact of our questions.

Mr. de Grandpre?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You say that this brief represents the opinion of a group of senior students?

MISS FRANK: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do I understand this group is here now, or are you delegates or representatives of this group which would include a larger number of students?

MISS FRANK: We are the majority of the group. There are several who have not been able to come.

MR. de GRANDPRE: This group comprises how many members ?

MISS FRANK: Seven members.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think they are all listed

at the end of the brief, Mr. de Grandpre. I notice two who have not been able to come.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Then you go on in the second of your brief on page 1:

"We do not want, as at present, a monopolistic control of television."

Would you expand on this and give us your thoughts as to the alternative that you suggest?

MISS FRANK: We suggest something after the manner of the B.B.C. in London. That is what we had in mind, but not, perhaps, as so directly controlled by Government.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, let me just see if we can get at that, because frankly I find it difficult to understand your meaning in this sentence, having regard to the rest of your brief. We have had this same sort of point put to us, that the C.B.C. monopoly, as it has been called, was a bad thing and the suggestion was that there ought to be -- it ought to be broken up by having a number of private commercial stations, television stations. I take it from the rest of your brief that commercialism is a concern to you and the many, many commercials and the time taken by them is something to be deplored, I think that is your word -- so that when you use monopolistic control of television, are you really talking about the possibility or the thought of Governmental control?

MISS FRANK: Yes, that is what we thought.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I see. "As at the present time". I do not want to go too far into this

with you. It has been suggested to us that the C.B.C. is responsible to Parliament rather than to the Government, and there is a distinction drawn between the two; and I think it was said to us out in Vancouver by the University of British Columbia people that this was a relatively new technique developed in Canada for getting away from the danger of Governmental intervention and at the same time providing public funds. Did this come into your thinking at all?

MISS FRANK: No, we have not thought of that.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But following the Chairman's approach, I can hardly reconcile your suggestion about getting away from commercial interests and at the same time not inviting competition to some extent. How do you visualize this new world in practice?

MISS FRANK: Mr. Lindala, would you like to answer that?

MR. LINDALA: Well, going back to the point Mr. Chairman brought up, I thought at the time that we reached this: That the C.B.C. should be placed on a par with private broadcasting. The general principle should be that both should be placed on an equal level with the private broadcasting not having -- how shall I say -- to get their permission to have stations opened up, to have to go to the C.B.C. to get this permission. They should both be on a competitive basis, the private and the C.B.C.

MR. de GRANDPRE: How would you expect these private stations to remain in business without commercialism?

MR. LINDALA: It is not the point of commercialism. I am not arguing that at this moment, sir. I mean the C.B.C. -- both the C.B.C. and the private stations should be under the control of Parliament, not under the control of the C.B.C., as I believe it is at the moment. Am I making myself clear?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. I do not know if you were here at the time when Mr. Stewart brought up this point, that under our present statutes under Section 8, the C.B.C. is charged with the duty of developing a national broadcasting system and, as it has been put to us, they are building this system partly by producing programmes for their own stations and partly by having their programmes carried by private stations. That is the way this job is done. The point you specifically mention of licensing, that is all done by statute, done by the Government acting through the Department of Transport, and not by the C.B.C., but I think when you speak of monopolistic control of television you are not thinking in terms of having a new station in the field, that there ought to be another outlet necessarily opened. That was not your point. It was a matter of internal control between the C.B.C. and the private stations; is that right?

MR. LINDALA: Yes, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: This was another expression to describe an independent regulatory body?

MR. LINDALA: It was.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, you bring up the question that even if they are commercial programmes,

it still costs the Canadian citizen indirectly the same amount of money as if he had to pay taxes to get a similar programme. That is the first point that you are making in the fourth paragraph of your brief on page 1. Yesterday we had before us another student, Mr. Rogers, who expressed another opinion. He said that, in his view, the sponsoring of a programme by an advertiser had the effect of increasing sales and thereby reducing the cost of the particular product, and that, in the long run, the consumer was paying less money for the same product notwithstanding the fact that an additional amount was included in the price for covering the advertising cost. Would you like to comment on this point and push this statement further and give us reasons why you take that view?

MISS FRANK: We made that statement because we did feel that it was exactly the same in taxes and in paying for the commodity. We do not feel that it produces or makes the price lower necessarily.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, I noted that you did mention that you were not a representative cross-section of the teen-agers, but since you are here would you care to indicate what particular programmes are of interest to you as a group or to the other young college boys and girls, so that we have some opinion before us?

MISS FRANK: Well, we enjoy all the Wednesday night programmes and any programmes like that. We enjoy the Wednesday C.B.C. programmes where there is a play ---

THE CHAIRMAN: That special Wednesday night C.B.C. programme?

MISS FRANK: Yes, any programme like that we enjoy. We enjoy programmes of good music. We also enjoy programmes of good jazz music. That is included in good music. We enjoy plays, book reviews, current events; but the programmes that seem to have been put on for teen-agers, frankly we are bored by them.

MR. de GRANDPRE: How does your opinion compare with the opinion of others? You have probably had the opinion discussed with other students and were you the exception that confirmed the rule, or how did you stand in these discussions on the value of certain programmes?

MISS FRANK: Well, some people enjoy them and some people don't. It depends on the person.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you can be of some help to us, Miss Frank. It is very helpful for us to be able to talk with you about this. We have had a good deal of conflict of evidence between the so-called cultural type of programmes and the partly-entertainment type of programme, and there have been people who suggested that the C.B.C. cultural programmes are not listened to and they are just a waste of time and money.

I would be interested in getting your opinion as to whether or not that is a correct appraisal of the type of better-class cultural programmes, the fare, that is offered to a group such as yourselves.

How do you feel about it?

MISS FRANK: Do you mean ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I am really only trying to understand your own statement. Let us take the Wednesday night C.B.C. programme. I take it from what you say you like that?

MISS FRANK: Yes, we all enjoy that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then you would not agree with the contention that we have had put to us, that this cultural effort is a wasted effort?

MISS FRANK: Certainly not.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is all, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Miss Frank and fellow students, I want to thank you for taking the trouble you have taken and for coming here and for expressing the line of thought that you have in this fashion. It is very helpful to us to have submissions from groups such as yourselves, and if I may, I would like to congratulate you not only for the work you have done but for the excellent way you have put it in your brief.

Thank you for coming.

We have one more rather special case to hear. It is special in that it is an individual brief which an interested member of the public has prepared.

We have made a general rule that, except for very special reasons, we cannot hear individual

briefs of the public. We do hear these organizations who prepare briefs and ask to be heard, although there are many organizations who have submitted briefs who do not wish to appear. I want to say this: That whether from organizations or from individuals, submissions that are put to us will be considered and will be studied and taken into the best account we can in reaching our conclusions later on.

This one is being made special because I think there was some misunderstanding about it, and Mr. Spilak has been here for a couple of days. We therefore decided this morning that we would file his brief. It will be marked as Exhibit 114, and if you will read to us your concluding section.

We will leave it, at any rate, in that rather restricted presentation, but I do not want you to think that because of the rather limited presentation it will not be considered. It will be. Would you read the conclusion, Mr. Spilak?

INDIVIDUAL BRIEF SUBMITTED BY MR. JOHN SPILAK

EXHIBIT NO. 114: Brief submitted by Mr. John Spilak.

MR. SPILAK: Before I read this, I would like to state that, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have not been influenced by any briefs released either in relation to the C.B.C. or private interests.

The opinions expressed in this brief will be my own and I will read the conclusion now.

From all sides, there emanates a voicing of opinion - pro and con - regarding the control of broadcasting in Canada. Due to the monopolistic jurisdiction of the present board, broadcasting has not had the opportunity to develop its resources to the maximum. A new policy would benefit Canadian economy, elevate national prestige, enhance national status and initiate a more vigorous campaign in the advancement of arts, education and culture. The adoption of a more resourceful policy would aid in fostering a sense of dedicated responsibility on the part of broadcasting and would help broadcasting achieve its proper and useful place in the Canadian scene.

The following conclusions are based on the foregoing comments and observations.

That means the foregoing pages, not just the above portions.

The main drawbacks which handicap the full development of broadcasting in Canada are as follows:

(a) The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's Board of Governors prohibits the establishment of network operations by private stations and does not sanction these private stations to enter into agreements with American networks or American independent stations.

By not operating on a network basis, private

stations are unable to utilize their potential in many aspects. As to the question of private stations entering into agreements with American concerns, there is, however, a point which should be emphasized; restrictions should be placed on the content of programmes and the amount of American broadcasting time consumed.

(b) The present regulations provide that licenses may be granted for a stipulated period of time, namely three years.....

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Somebody told us the other day that had been extended to five years.

MR. SPILAK: It probably has.

... By compelling private stations to operate within these boundaries, their length of tenure is uncertain and, as a result, an investment in station and programme improvement is exposed to a risk.

If private stations were placed on a permanent basis, they would feel more secure in planning an outlay of their expenditures. Consideration should be given to the establishment of private stations and networks on a charter basis subject to observance of strict regulations covering the control of programme and advertising content, the frequency and length of commercials, the obligation to supply national and community services, the assurance of programme variety and progressive broadcasting, and the responsibility of providing national coverage.

The foregoing objects of the charter would be drawn up with a realistic view to present day conditions and would allow a substantial measure of freedom to reflect the current position of broadcasting in Canada.

(c) Within the jurisdiction of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's Board of Governors lie extravagant powers which, if exercised to the limit, could bring about the downfall of most private stations. The vesting of such powers in the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation gives it a distinct advantage over the private broadcasters in relation to licensing, commercial competition, channel allocations and network broadcasting.

To remove the private broadcasters from their present unfair status and to place them on a par with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the suggested impartial Broadcasting and Telecasting Control Board is the most logical solution.

(d) The non-existence of a separate control board to govern broadcasting in Canada violates all basic principles of a democratic administration.

The birth of an independent and impartial regulatory body is the prime requisite in the establishment of a satisfactory control of broadcasting. This board would exercise authority over the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and private broadcasters, and would enforce similar regulations upon both.

Steps should be taken immediately

to appoint a permanent nine-man board consisting of distinguished members of the public representing arts, religion, labour, industry, education and a social and political expert, a television critic and two members of Parliament. This board would be responsible to Parliament on all matters pertaining to broadcasting. Upon appointment, the board members would be required to relinquish all their interests in the field of broadcasting.

In order that the members may spend all their time in this endeavour, an equitable salary should be provided. This salary would be derived from transmitters' fees which would be paid annually by all broadcasting and telecasting stations.

The duties of the board would entail the adoption and modification of existing regulations and the initiating of legislation to conform to the conditions of the broadcasting industry today.

Under the jurisdiction of the Broadcasting and Telecasting Control Board would come the following regulatory functions:

1. Control of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and private broadcasters;
2. Control of the establishment of networks with the authority to suspend their operations upon failure to comply with the regulations set down by the Board;
3. Control of licensing and the authority to impose an annual fee upon transmitters; --

That doesn't mean transmitters. That means

people that own stations too.

4. Control of channel allocations and all technical problems which may arise;

5. Control of programme and commercial content;

6. Control of advertising frequency;

7. Enforcement of the reservation of time allotted to political parties, welfare organizations and government agencies, with the stipulation that equal times be assigned to all parties and organizations;

8. Power to make final decisions in the case of a dispute. At the same time, there should be a provision whereby the parties concerned may appeal to a higher court;

9. Control of the use of recordings and transcriptions; and

10. Amendment of the Canadian Broadcasting Act and the Radio-telegraph Act so that any conflicting interpretations relating to the distinction of a private system from a national system may be prevented.

THE CHAIRMAN: The last page of your brief says, Mr. Spilak, you live in Hamilton.

MR. SPILAK: I do, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am merely getting this on the record.

MR. SPILAK: Yes, that is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: And your occupation is that of a Parts Manager for Wheel & Brake Service Limited?

MR. SPILAK: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you told me privately beforehand that you had taken some course in radio and television.

MR. SPILAK: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Engineering and electronic. Is that the kind of course?

MR. SPILAK: No, it was production.

THE CHAIRMAN: But your present activities do not include any actual television or radio activities?

MR. SPILAK: None whatsoever.

THE CHAIRMAN: As I said before, we welcome these briefs and will give it consideration. We do appreciate the fact that you have, as an individual, taken the trouble to present your ideas and to have had it prepared in a very presentable way and submitted it to us.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPILAK: I appreciate the fact you have allowed me to present it here.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn until 10.00 o'clock in the morning.

---The hearings adjourned at 5.10 P.M., until 10.00 A.M.
Friday, June 1, 1956.

I N D E X

MAY 31, 1956.

<u>SUBMISSIONS BY:</u>	<u>Page</u>
YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF CANADA. . . .	2515
Mrs. R. Smith	
Mrs. Agnes Roy	
Miss Earith Gould	
IMPERIAL ORDER DAUGHTERS OF THE EMPIRE. . .	2532
Mrs. J.P. Detwiler.	
Mrs. Lumbers	
CANADIAN MENTAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION . . .	2565
Dr. J.D. Griffin	
Dr. Reva Gerstein, Ph.D.	
THE BUREAU OF BROADCAST MEASUREMENT . . .	2589
Mr. C.R. Vint	
Mr. H.M. Stovin	
Mr. A.T. Gamble	
Mr. C.H. McDonald	
Mr. C.J. Follett	
THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF MUSICIANS OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA . . .	2606
Mr. Walter M. Murdoch	
MAPLE LEAF GARDENS LIMITED . . .	2656
Mr. Henry Bolton	
Mr. S.G. Evans	
THE CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION, INCORPORATED . . .	2660
Mr. H. Deveney	
Mr. G.A. Wright	
Mr. C.V. Box	
Mr. N.R. Speirs	
GROUP OF STUDENTS OF JARVIS COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE . . .	2677
Miss Rosemary Frank	
INDIVIDUAL BRIEF BY MR. JOHN SPILAK . . .	2689

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

MAY 31, 1956

<u>No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
106	Exhibit from Young Women's Christian Association of Canada.	2515
107	Brief of the Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire.	2532
108	Brief of the Canadian Mental Health Association.	2565
109	Brief of The Bureau of Broadcast Measurement.	2589
110	Brief of The American Federation of Musicians of the United States and Canada.	2606
110-A	Article referring to allegation concerning the incursions of recorded music and electronics.	2610
111	Brief by Maple Leaf Gardens Limited.	2656
112	Brief of Canadian Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Incorporated.	2660
113	Brief of Jarvis Collegiate Institute Group of Students.	2677
114	Brief submitted by Mr. John Spilak	2689
